428 the father's property. The egalitarian spirit of the Bedouin
596 inheritance rule functions to maintain the unity of the family, and, at another level of social complexity, the structural continuity of the corporate group. Ideally, the surviving sons will keep intact their father's estate, his land and animals, and will work it as a unit. And this is generally
596 the case in al-Qasr. On the other hand, there is also the
594 implicit assumption in the structural principle of the
*613 Bedouin segmentary lineage system that each individual will
•183 eventually establish a unit of his own, separate from but interrelated with, the main household. As a result, there
596 usually develops some division of property and labor among
•593 surviving brothers. Whether or not this division is formally agreed upon, and, whether or not it is assigned by the father or the eldest son is largely arbitrary. In some cases, the father makes such a decision before his death and prepares his sons for it. The father's concern is that good relations be maintained between his sons after his death. Just as the father mediates conflict between his sons during his life, so he hopes to maintain peace between them after his death. The Bedouins say that a father should be fair when dealing with his sons, and that he should never favor one over the other.

428 Inheritance is determined through the patrilineal
*[613] lineage principle. The Bedouins of al-Qasr claim that they

moral community, we cannot proceed to a discussion of the internal and external systems of political relations.

As a result of the socialization process, and through relations with other members of the family, an individual comes to recognize that his conduct is measurable by certain standards of, what is considered by the group to be, good and bad, right and wrong. In al-Qasr, such standards are intrinsically correct, or "decent" as the Bedouins say; obedience to the authority representing these standards is interpreted as a "duty." The authoritative aspect of the role of household head (shaib al-bait), and the moral obligations which it represents, emerge from and reinforce values and structural arrangements central to Bedouin social order, namely, respect for authority and devotion to social groups, the two basic elements of morality defined by Durkheim (Parsons 1937:382-385).

The value placed upon social order, and the structural mechanisms for insuring its realization and extension--kinship, residence and contract--inform an authority structure which ranges between filial piety at the family level and a set of legal norms at the level of the external political system. The fact that the Bedouins of al-Qasr are interested in integrating a larger population into their authority structure means that a common value is operative in the range of it; also that one sphere of authority will tend to merge into another. Hence the father-son authority relation has importance for the strength of Bedouin customary law in the desert. The

high value placed upon conformity to rules governing authority relations makes Bedouin society of al-Qasr less individualistic than, for instance, the Iatmul of New Guinea who "set no exaggerated value upon extremely orderly behavior" (Bateson 1958:31). Social cohesion in al-Qasr is sustained through what Durkheim called "mechanical solidarity."

The Bedouin father is in a disciplinary position over his washuun, his wife (wives) and his children. (The word, washuun, must be of Berber origin for I am unable to trace it in Arabic.) Although the father has the right to beat his washuun, the Bedouins say that he does so "only in rare cases, when it is necessary." During my time in the field I heard of no physical punishment being dealt out by a father.

The dyadic relationship of father and son roles is the focal field of authority in the family. The pattern of behavior in this relationship is marked typically by restraint on the part of the son. The father orders and the son obeys unquestioningly. If the father accidentally uses a taboo word, such as 'ammar which in standard Arabic means "to fill" but in the Bedouin dialect means "to have sexual intercourse," the son will immediately depart the scene in a high state of embarrassment. In this way, the boy is not only excluded from gatherings and activities in which his father participates, but he is also made to maintain a respectable social distance from his father's age-set. There are other ways of

593 handling the potential conflict between father and son and the successive generations which they represent; these are mechanisms which preclude intimacy between the father and the son. The social statuses of father and son are not permitted to overlap by their being participants in, or even present at, festive occasions, such as circumcision and wedding parties, occasions which are marked by erotic poems and lewd songs. It would be "wrong" for a father to accompany his son to one of these parties. In the one instance that I did observe a father and son together at a wedding party, the Bedouins explained the rare occurrence by pointing out that this was the man's only son, and so he treated him "like a brother."

593 852 585 [831]

593 866 The Bedouins of al-Qasr recognize the aloofness of the father from the son and justify it as a training period to prepare the boy for the time when he will be on his own. One young man explained the underlying rationale of the father-son relationship in this way:

> There are different kinds of fathers. One wishes to make his son a man, to make his son self-dependent at an early age. Other fathers destroy the personalities of their sons. For instance, the first type of father gives his son the responsibility of selling something, or buying something, or of supervising a chore in his own place. But the second type of father is usually soft with his son; he doesn't depend on his son due to his young age. He is very cautious with him and will not send him anywhere, and if he does he will ask someone to look after him. Of course, the first type of father is good and the second type is bad.

593 In al-Qasr it is a rare sight to see a father and his young son together, and it is only slightly more common to see the father with the grown son. The second case may simply be a reflection of the division of labor since the son, once grown, takes over the economic tasks of his father.

593 867 584 872 The most important duties of a father toward his son are three: he must teach him generosity, courage and courtesy; he must see that the boy learns the Quran; and he must arrange a good marriage for his son. According to 593 852 [872] [583] Peters (1960:34), the Cyrenaican Bedouin father must attend to three things for his son, namely: his circumcision, his education in the Quran, and his bridewealth when he marries. [179] In al-Qasr, the Egyptian school teachers have succeeded in showing the Bedouin that circumcision is a private family 593 852 198 affair and not a public ritual. Although all fathers still see to it that their sons are circumcised, the father is no longer responsible for "making a circumcision party." In [626] [481] fact, the father who does insist on following the old ways by hiring a dancer and publicly marking his son's rite de passage, will be ridiculed as one "who only wants to make money from the ritual gift (naquut) given the boy."

593 The son recognizes the rights which the father has over him through a show of respect and obedience. A boy shows deference toward his father by not smoking, singing, or reciting poetry of any kind in his presence. During the

593 [207] [171] During the present time when most of the Bedouins own a transistor radio, a son will not even listen to songs or poetry broadcast over the air if his father is within hearing distance. I once witnessed a well-meaning father try unsuccessfully to get his ten year old son to sit down and listen with him to the news on the radio. This automatic deference paid to the father is extended to all male elders: the father-son relationship is the model for authority relations between generations. But there are degrees in which the model is applied to behavior; for instance, a boy will not smoke in front of his older brother, his uncles and grandfather, but will feel no uneasiness about smoking in the company of an elder with whom he has no immediate authority relationship.

593 561 [296]

593 The filial piety which marks the father-son authority relationship is owed to the father until his death. As the son grows older, he may show a little less constraint but he still plays the role of the subordinate. For example, I never saw a son argue with his father over anything during my stay in the field, with one serious exception. One man who had broken off friendly relations with his brother objected to the presence of his brother's sons at the wedding of his own daughter. When he threatened to cause a public scene to embarrass his nephews before the other guests, his own sons defended the right of their cousins to be at their sister's wedding. They told their father that his quarrel

593 was with his brother and not his brother's sons. When the father persisted with his intention to embarrass his nephews, his sons, as a last alternative, threatened to leave him. In the face of this threat, the father capitulated.

The rights and duties of the father-son relationship, although they do not change in sentiment, will change in content during the lifetime of the father. The main change [421] in content will be a reflection of a change in property re- 593 lations. The Bedouin believe that this is the way it ought 577 to be; they say that

> A son must respect and obey his father. The son must do anything that he can to help and please his father. When the son grows up and begins to earn money, he must contribute generously to his father. A son pleases his father by giving him money and helping him to be comfortable.

593 In boyhood and manhood, the father has disposal over his son's 596 labor. As long as a son lives in his father's naja' this is [464] so. One son, who worked for an American oil company in the desert, regularly turned over his pay check to his father. It is the father who decides where the son will live, and, whether or not he will have his own domicile away from the [591] main naja'. When the son marries and brings his wife to the naja', he will usually set up his tent next to his father's tent. The tent is given to the boy by his father. During 593 the son's growing-up period, he will be given, as gifts on 431 various occasions, a sheep or a number of sheep which will be kept with the father's flock.

593 be kept with the father's flock. Only in the case of a
[591] man's owning, or using, a large piece of land in the pasture area of al-Qasr will his son live away from the main part of the naja', i.e., away from his father's tent. The son then serves as his father's shepherd.

593 In the 'izba sector of al-Qasr, the pattern is gener-
591 ally the same except that the son will be given a room in
184 the house rather than a tent when he marries. Since the land in this area is more scarce and a matter of official ownership, the son is not likely to have his own house during his father's lifetime.

593 When the son does marry, the marriage proceedings may
584 be initiated by either the son or the father. But, under no circumstances that I heard of, would the son approach the father with the idea of his marriage; the son should communicate his desire to marry, first of all, to either his father's brother or his mother's brother. As the Bedouins
593 say, "Marriage is an agreement between fathers." What they
584 mean is that marriage is an agreement between tertiary groups.
*613 A father upon hearing of his son's wish to marry, for the boy's uncle will immediately tell the father, consults with the head of his tertiary group about such a proposed marriage. This is not a formal procedure but, certainly, the father would not go ahead with the marriage without making the matter public. In other words, marriage in al-Qasr is a

584
#613
[593]

public corporate affair and not a private one.

The head of the boy's tertiary group then relays the information about the marriage to the heads of the other tertiary segments which make up the secondary group. Again, this is an informal procedure but all corporate representatives must be informed of, and must approve of, the proposed marriage. Thus is the corporate channel of communication kept open and the corporate network of authority relations maintained through a reciprocal exchange of rights and duties. It is, as Fortes (1949:209) has noted, the lineage principle which compels a man to consult and gain the support of his lineage-mates in any matter of importance, or even in trivial matters. Demands are channeled through the corporate lines, "for no jural act takes place except in the framework of the lineage system."

584
#613
626
[593]

If the father should not consult the secondary group concerning his son's marriage--he may anticipate objections and consider his son's desires above those of the group--there are sanctions, forms of moral coercion, which can be applied by the group. First, a man may be fined if he goes through with an objectionable marriage; added to this, the man may be denied access to the preferred channels of marriage which exist within the lineage; lastly, dependent upon the gravity of the situation, the man may be threatened with expulsion from the lineage group.

593 The daughter and wife roles are also subject to the dominant role of father in al-Qasr Bedouin society. The father has virtually the right of life and death over his daughter in certain situations. But in no case does he have this right over his wife. The differentiation in right here 593 *613 is again a matter of the authority principle operating within the framework of the lineage system. A man's daughter belongs [851] to his patrilineage or authority group while his wife belongs to the authority group of her father. There is an obvious [582] exception to this statement about Bedouin society, for given the practice of parallel-cousin marriage a man and his wife can belong to the same authority group, the same tertiary 593 group. Even so, only the father has the right of life and death over the girl who is his daughter. The Bedouins say, "The bones of the girl belong to the father." There are two 593 situations in which a father may rightfully put his daughter 684 to death: when she is found guilty of pre-marital intercourse (loss of virginity), or if it is proved that she has had any extra-marital sexual activity. In either case, if the husband were to kill the girl he would be guilty of murder and his group would have to forfeit blood-money or be threatened with retaliation. I heard of no such actual cases.

593 The father's major duty toward his daughter is to 584 provide her with "a good marriage." This, of course, parallels his duty toward his son and emphasizes that a father is con-

593 cerned with his own and his group's status in marriage arrange-
[584] ments. One informant said that a rich man must marry into a
[581] rich group. The Bedouin have a saying which is relevant here:
*[613] "Your bait is equal to the bait into which you marry." Before her marriage the girl's duty toward her father is to respect and obey him. After her marriage "her only duty is that she
[758] must visit him from time to time. If he becomes sick, and he has no wife, she must care for him and nurse him."

593 It was a common sight to see a Bedouin father fondle
834 his daughter of age six years or younger, but beyond this age physical intimacy ceases. The Bedouin say that a father should not kiss or hold on his knee a daughter over the age of eleven. After the girl marries, a definite avoidance custom characterizes the father-daughter role relationship. The Bedouin say that the father will not see the face of his daughter after her marriage. This means that the married daughter remains veiled before her father, and even before her older brothers. This type of avoidance custom is rare by comparison with the cross-cultural data (Driver 1966).

593 A wife obeys her husband concerning all matters: "she does not even leave the house without his permission." A woman may go and complain to her father if her husband does not provide for her, i.e., with food and clothing, or if he unjustly beats her or continually threatens to beat her. On the other hand, if a woman is in the wrong "it is

593 not considered bad for a man to beat his wife." In the case
593 of ill-treatment by the husband, her father may take the
*613 matter to the corporate head. Traditionally, the corporate
[792] head would order the husband to move his tent next to the tend of the "holy man" or some other third party, so that he would be dissuaded against such behavior. Another reason
[586] for this is so that the girl might have witnesses to support her petition for divorce should the husband continue to beat her. I heard of no wife-beating while I was in al-Qasr.

595 The Quran states that a man may lawfully take four
[779] wives, but that if he feels he cannot treat each of them equally, he should take only one (Sura IV:3 and 129). The Bedouins are conscientious in practicing this rule, though
595 perhaps not for religious reasons. If a man has more than
593 one wife, he must spend an equal amount of time with each. Conflict between co-wives is lessened by the fact that a man will have separate tents, or rooms in the case of a house, for each wife. A man will not buy a dress or a piece of jewelry for one wife without buying a copy of it for all other wives.
595 On a trip to the Siwa Oasis, I was accompanied by a man who
593 had three wives and wished to bring them a gift of basketry
114 upon his return. He was successful in buying two baskets which were similar but could not find a comparable third in
[431] the oasis market. In dismay, he made a gift of the baskets to me and returned with no souvenirs at all. One of my in-

595 One of my in-
124 formants, a wealthy man and a poet, said that since he could not love two women equally he would never take a second wife. He also said that he was unwilling to give his daughter to a man who refused to promise him that she would be his only wife.

•593 Throughout his life, the father is dominant and his washuun is subjective. He is the master of his naja' and the
[596] social behavior of his wife and offspring toward him has both a moral and a pragmatic aspect. They show respect and obed-
[768] ience because "it is the decent thing to do;" further, just as he provides for their material needs while he is alive, so the property which he leaves them will sustain them after
428 his death. As we have already noted, in theory, the daughters
[562] inherit one-half of the shares which the sons receive; in fact, females inherit only if they are the sole survivors of the male. But the surviving wife, or wives, will take a cash amount equal to their brideprice from the husband's estate. The Bedouins say that this price will be paid before any other inheritance shares are distributed. In addition, the
768 wife has the right to remain in her husband's house or tent, and it is the duty of the eldest son to look after her. She may remain at home until death, provided she never brings a man who may be considered a prospective husband into the house.

593 The rights and duties involved in the father-washuun relationship show that the ideal authority structure of the

593 family is a dominant-subjective one. But the rights and duties of the father have no legal sanctions. His authority grows out of the moral and mutual dependence, the common interests and value, which hold the family together. The
593 183 867 authority relations learned in the family become the norms of behavior to be applied by the individual in a wider-scale network of social relations. The son learns the discipline-respect relationship which is the model of behavior between generations. The subjective role which the daughter plays in the father-daughter relationship prepares her for the role of wife.

Marriage and Kinship Relations

582

The parallel-cousin, the father's brother's daughter, is the preferred mate in Bedouin marriage. Parallel-cousin marriage in al-Qasr is more of an ideal than a practice. In fact, parallel-cousin marriage is not practical in the case where social order depends upon the integration of a larger and clearly segmented population. Endogamy of this kind in this type of society works against survival in a double-edged way: economic security through cooperation with a larger group is discouraged, and political security through
171 coalition is undermined. In the Middle East, as elsewhere,
582 cross-cousin marriage is the normative practice which functions "as a counterweight to the tendency of unilineal descent group-

604 538 brother to special place in the social structure states that [539] "Two-thirds of the boy belongs to the khal, and he is like the father: the remaining one-third is divided equally between the father and the khal." The Bedouins are always quick to point out to the stranger, such as I was, that this means there is only one-sixth of the boy which belongs to the father. A clearer case of the ideology of kinship versus [539] descent could not be had. Another proverb has it that "the good which you see in a boy comes from khal khalu ("the maternal uncle of his maternal uncle"). Any kinship relation may be the basis for a new network of social relations by making use of the classificatory principle. The Bedouins [539] exaggerate the status and role of the mother's brother by saying that "when a boy does good or bad, one wants to know the name of his khal not the name of his father." This statement, which favors cognatic links over patrilineal ties, is not true but such an attempt at emphasis indicates that this relationship is something of value in the Bedouin society.

604 578 In the case of any conflict "between his tribes," the Bedouins say, "the boy must support the tribe of his khal." This, of course, does not mean that the individual should take up arms against his patrilineal corporate group, but that he should seek to mediate the conflict. The political 562 • 593 554 182 578 value of conflict avoidance and conflict control is also conspicuous in the dual role which the mature female plays

562 593 554 182 578 in Bedouin society, that is, the role of wife-daughter. The principles of patrilineality and cognation do not work against each other when the girl marries outside her corporate group, nor does her new dual role present a case of role conflict. 562 593 554 182 578 On the contrary, the wife-daughter role functions to bind together two groups which are structurally differentiated by the rule of patrilineality. During time of peace, the wife-*613 [431] [628] [574] daughter acts as a bond-maker by carrying gifts back and forth between the two groups, often bringing some of her younger patrilineal relatives back to her husband's house or tent for short visits. 562 593 554 [726] [584] During a time of conflict or war, the Bedouins point out, she is the only person who can cross the battle lines unharmed. She is a match-maker as well as a peace-maker. Often she influences the selection of mates by individuals in both her husband's group and her father's group. 562 593 554 582 The Bedouins say that "after the bint 'amm, a man should marry his bint khal ("mother's brother's daughter") because she is like his bint 'amm." Usually, over a period of a few generations, a given direction in marriage is sustained (see Figure 10), and it is one function of this wife-daughter role to accomplish this important political action.

562 593 554 *613 182 The role of wife-daughter, then, may be seen as one important aspect of what Fortes (1953:33) calls, "complementary filiation," the essential mechanism which provides the link between the corporate groups of al-Qasr society and the kin groups of the parent who does not determine descent.

586 at the time of divorce (if the husband is in fault), and also
583 at the time of the husband's death; and, sadaaq al-musaama
768 ("price of friendship") is paid to the wife when her husband
595 takes a second, third or fourth wife.

586 The second divorce case which happened while I was
158 in al-Qasr involved, what seems to be, an instance of psychotic behavior. A girl, who had married shortly before I arrived in the field, would fall into a deep sleep every time she entered her husband's house. Each time her father would come for her and take her home until she had recovered. But upon her return, three different times, she became ill again. Finally, her father and the husband agreed that this marriage would not work, and the father returned the mahr to the man. This case lasted over the period of almost a year while I lived in al-Qasr. I suggested to the father that perhaps his daughter did not wish to be married to this man but he assured me that "she loved him very much."

586 If the girl's father is dead, so that she cannot return to his house at the time of divorce, she will go to live with the brother who needs her services. It then be-
586 comes the duty of the brother to make another marriage for
587 his sister, and in the case that he does it becomes his right
593 to claim the mahr for himself. The Bedouins say that virginity,
583 or the lack of it, in the case of the divorced woman is no issue; just so a man knows "she is from a good family."

57] The model of
*613 corporate authority structure, i.e., that which makes the
•[593] corporation-corporate sole relationship meaningful, is the
[604] father-son-father's brother triad. The submission of the son in the fundamental dyadic and triadic relationships of Bedouin society is carried over to the, just as axiomatic, relationship between corporate member and corporate sole. Peters (1965:127) is enlightening on this point when he says

[593] All men of a corporation, in any event, "speak with one word" at a moot, and a son, by his assent to the common view, also supports his father; in so doing he yields to the political authority of his corporation, and not that of his father.

The structure of authority relations which obtains within and between the groups of al-Qasr, then, is reflected in the idea or concept of 'aqila. It is meaningful to the Bedouins. The social order which it represents is legitimate because of the moral attribute and obligation which attaches to its symbolization in the political office. At the same time, this focus or office of authority tends to become pivotal for the extension of a sphere of moral judgments and authority relations along with the expansion of social structural relations and promotion of common interests. Easton (1959) has referred to this expansion as "the political community," and Middleton and Tait (1958) as "the jural community." At all levels of society, conflict and consensus take place in terms of certain ideas concerning good and bad, operational

*613 578 571 554 the Bedouins. Conflict regulation treats the expressions of social conflict and not its causes.

The 'aqila regulates conflict between the members of his tertiary segment, between this group and the other groups of the secondary unit, and between secondary units of the tribe. He operates in both the internal and external systems *613 578 •593 554 [596] of authority relations. The 'aqila may pre-empt the authority of the shaib in the sphere of familial authority, though, the Bedouins say, this seldom happens because the son is willing to obey his father. Having been reared in the culture, and as a future father himself, the son supports the respect-*613 578 discipline principle of Bedouin society. But in extreme cases, such as the threat of a father to disown his son, the explicit 593 428 554 approval of the 'aqila, and of all the 'awaaqil of the secondary corporate group, is necessary. This is the procedure in all cases of banishment. In one case (which I document below), a man disinherited his younger brother with the formal approval of his hwaaqil.

*613 682 578 [181] [681] The tertiary group in Bedouin society is by definition the blood-vengence group. However, in view of the common values and pragmatic interests of its members, the secondary group fulfills this function. Traditionally, when revenge killings were carried out according to the lex talionis, it was usually at the hand of some member of the victim's tertiary group. In the case of protracted conflict, such as extended

to possess the wisdom which it takes to regulate conflict. Theoretically, as one 'aqila said, conflict should be stopped at the familial level, either by the father or the paternal uncle, and should never reach the level of the 'aqila. Once before the 'aqila, conflict assumes new structural poses, or different orientation in authority relations. Authority here is differentiated in terms of the context: the father's authority relates to the familial structural level, and beyond this level the father per se cannot exercise legitimate authority. The 'aqila, who is responsible for internal order and external relations exercises legitimate authority at each level of the political structure. The authority of the 'aqila is checked and prevented from growing into naked power in that any single 'aqila must consult with the other 'awaaqil of the secondary segment concerning matters which may concern the structural nature and continuity of the group.

In many respects, the authority structure in al-Qasr corresponds to that defined for the Lugbara of Uganda (Middleton 1960). The structural levels (see Figure 7 above) of 'Ailit Ma'fas (secondary), Bait 'Umar (tertiary), and 'Ait Abd al-Malik (sub-tertiary) are approximately equivalent to Middleton's major, minor, and minimal lineages (1960:7-9). But whereas among the Lugbara authority roles are purely kinship roles, i.e., genealogically senior heads are responsible for internal control and representation, among the Bedouins of

685 I was in al-Qasr, and each party to the conflict hired
578 Egyptian lawyers in Marsa Matruh to represent them. As one
648 litigant in this case told me: "The Bedouins prefer to settle their own land disputes because the government's way of handling these things costs money and long periods of waiting."

69 The notion of jurisprudence in tribal cultures, in
121 general, seems to be one which concentrates on the restoration
578 of a disturbed balance rather than one concerned with formality and procedure. To a great extent, this is true in the Bedouin case also. However, the absence of institutionalized ways of dealing with conflict is more characteristic of the internal
*613 system of political relations. Conflict within the secondary
578 segment, we have noticed, may be regulated at the familial
• [593] level of authority by the shaib, or one acting in his place:
[596] it is hoped by the Bedouins that quarrels never become serious enough to prompt intervention by the 'aqila. On the other hand, the 'aqila, as a legitimate representative of his authority group, will almost always become involved in conflict regulation falling within the sphere of external political relations, i.e., conflict between secondary, primary, or tribal segments.

The 'aqila as the most effective mechanism of social
*613 control has become institutionalized through time in Bedouin
578 society. At the interactional level of secondary lineage
182 group relations, conflict may easily expand into feuding or,

554 571 [577] [585] [796] [124] [431] 554 571 182 561 [593] It would be considered "wrong" for the members of this group to present themselves at an al-Qasr wedding party, or the annual celebration held in honor of a local saint of the area. When I inquired about the conspicuous absence of some of my chief informants from such gatherings, I was told that "they will send their gifts," or that "it is not decent that they come to something such as this." In terms of Bedouin social structure, there are a number of plausible explanations for this "status separation." Fathers should not attend public affairs at which their sons may be "performing," i.e., young men should be allowed to play a public role outside the confines of the father-son authority structure. By virtue of the extension of the father role, and its corresponding authoritarian attitude, every member of the elder age-set commands certain rights and obligations which would prevent the free expression that is the hallmark of Bedouin parties. Conversely, and at the more general level, members of the "status group" who wish to remain members of this circle accept certain restrictions on social [114] intercourse. At the five different Bedouin "parties" which I attended, there were "elders" present, but none of them could be classified as members of the "status group." Bedouins plainly state that elders should not attend parties, but, on the other hand, they show much more concern and emotion when they say that a member of the "status group" should not "be

613 681 mainly a declaration that, that particular person is no longer a member of the tribal segment and that his actions should not in any way reflect upon the tribal segment. The tribal segment referred to is usually the amar since it is only politically corporate group amoung Awlad Ali. The procedure is usually undertaken in cases of habitual offenders whose actions consistently bringing liability to the amar or disgracing it in relations with other tribal groups in the area. Due to the seriousness of the procedure (since it leaves the individual without the protection of his group), it is restricted. First, to announce the barawa of any of its members the amar has to get the unanimous agreement of all adult males of the gorup as represented by their Awaqil of their respective [675] baits. Lately such decisions have to be put in writing. The barawa [573] from the amar does not include the man's father, brothers, or sons. [678] These immediate relatives remain responsible for his actions even if they desire to detach themselves from such responsibility. This is mainly maintained not so much for the protection of the repeated offender but rather for the protection of unsuspecting people who happen to have dealings with him and who would be protected by the corporate responsibility of the man's immediate kin. In addition to repeated offenders, the [626] barawa or the threat of it is used to back the awaqil in their exercise of persuasion to get members of their baits to agree to their decisions, expecially those affecting the amar, like the collection of bloodmoney or the taking of the oath.

A man, on his part, may ask to be given a barawa from his amar. In this case, as shown in the amar papers of Aggary, he has to give good reasons for such a demand. The awaqil of the amar meet and discuss such

613 428 [562] everything ... his property, his name, and anything he can give him, like the position of the Aqila. This is only natural." While the office of the Aqila is inherited through the male line, there seems to be no special regard for seniority. Any son of the Aqila can succeed him in the position and it is usually left to the Aqila to select the son who is to succeed him. This decision is not usually the subject matter of brotherly rivalry since the position of Aqila is regarded more as a duty than as a privilege. There has been only one case in the entire area of the Western Desert in which such a decision has lead to open fighting between brothers. "When my father became very old and his eyes bothered him, he told me that I should become the Aqila and could not say no to him," said Shei'eb. "I didn't want to become the Aqila but this was the choice of my father and I have to obey .... You owe it to your father and family to carry on his responsibilities the same way you carry his name." It was patrilineal succession upon which Shei'eb based his case. Most uninterested parties believe that he and he alone had the legitimate claim to the position.

613 428 593

613 627 554 The importance of patrilineal succession as the basis of the Aqila's authority may be better understood by contrasting it to a closely related position, that of the "mardi". A man within a bait may acquire, by virtue of personal qualities, a reputation for wisdom and soundness of opinion which may overshadow that of the Aqila. Such a person becomes known throughout a certain area as a successful mediator and go-between; and therefore is called upon to solve disputes not limited to members of his own bait. He thus acquires an informal position which cuts across a number of baits and sometimes larger political units.

2: Mohsen E,O-5 (1958-1966) 1971 MT9 Libyan Bedouin MT9
Awlad Ali

CHAPTER V

MARRIAGE: A CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP

593 578 A survey of all disputes occurring among the eilat Aggary in the last five years shows that more than 70% were disputes over "women," the usual phrase referring to cases involving marital relations. Disagreement over matters arising out of quarrels between husband and wife or between one of the spouses and his or her in-laws often constitute the basis for these disputes. What seems to make marriage and the family particularly productive of conflict is the fact that although residence is commonly virilocal, and the majority of the women leaving their own families to live with the husband, the woman retains her membership in her father's family after the marriage, and her agnatic group keeps an active interest in her, even after she is married. Marriage then brings face to face the interests of two groups. These interests affect the relationship between the married couple; and, more importantly, the relationship between the latter affects the interests of their respective groups. This, in many instances, leads to direct conflict between the two groups.

593 578 602 613 [591]

581 671 585 675 The position of the Awlad Ali daraieb with regard to marriage relations is based on the Islamic law with minor modifications to suit the requirements of local life. According to the Muslim law, marriage is a civil contract affected by the request of one party and the agreement of the other. No witnesses are needed for the legalization of the marriage, according to some of the Shi'a sects, although the Sunni schools of Muslim jurisprudence insist that two adult male and two adult females

581 585 671 675 are necessary for the validation of the marriage contract. Modern legal systems which took as their basis the Islamic law of marriage and the family further required the registration of the marriage contract for the marriage to be legal.

584 585 429 593 The request and necessary response forming the marriage are supposed to be carried on by the parties involved. However, if either the groom or the bride is not of age, or is mentally unqualified, the transaction is carried on by his or her guardian, or "wakil." The wakil is the father, unless he is dead or an invalid, in which case the brothers [604] become the wakils. If the person has no brothers, then the uncles be- [184] come the wakil in the order stated. According to certain Sunni sects in Islam, a woman marrying for the first time is always represented by her wakil, even if she is of age. The assumption is that a woman who has never been married does not have the experience that enables her to enter into any kind of legally binding relationship such as marriage.

585 675 593 429 [604] Following the original Islamic idea, marriage among Awlad Ali is an oral agreement between the groom or his father and the guardian (wakil) of the bride-to-be (her father, if alive, or her closest male kin in the following order: her brothers, her uncles, her grandfather).

585 792 [619] [718] A religious man is sometimes asked to perform the marriage, although it is not required. Some persons might invite a member of the Murabiteen tribe or holy men to witness the marriage on the basis that his presence gives "baraka," or blessing, to the marriage. Before the application of

585 656 197 [675] [634] the State legal system to the area, marriage contracts were not registered. In recent years, however, and with the increased mobility of the tribal populations, more and more marriages are being registered in the administrative districts. Still, according to the unofficial estimates,

Still, according to the unofficial estimates, only about ten per cent of all marriages are registered, and these are mainly mixed marriages involving a tribal person and a non-tribal one or a tribal member who is not living in the area anymore. The reason is that such a spouse, especially when he is the husband, is not under the control of the tribal customs and therefore cannot be forced to fulfill his obligations if he fails to do so. Most of the tribal population still feel that marriage is a personal and family affair that should be kept away from the State legal system.

Marriage among Awlad Ali is a relatively informal procedure. When a man decides to marry a certain girl, he informs his mother who, in turn, informs his father. The father may have objections to his son's choice of the bride. Such objections may be based on already strained relations between the two families or the questionable reputation of the girl or any member of her family. In such cases, the father tries to dissuade his son from going ahead with the marriage. The father is usually successful in controlling his son's choice when the latter is dependent on his father for the payment of the bridewealth called "mahr" and for the support of his new household. This is usually the case in the man's first marriage. In subsequent marriages and in the cases where the son has independent means of support for himself and his bride, the father's control of the son's choice is minimal, and asking the father's approval is a matter of formality. In second and subsequent marriages, the approval of the older wives is essential. The older wives have no right to object to the husband taking an additional wife, but they have the right to object to the choice on the basis that the new bride is hard to get along with or that there is animosity between her family and the families of the other wives which makes

593 cooperation between the wives in household activities difficult. The
595 wives have to have reasonable grounds for their objection to the new
584 bride. But even then, the husband could still marry the woman of his
[431] choice, although in this case he has to bring gifts to the other wives as "nasafa," or making-up present.

584 If the family has no objections to the marriage, the proceedings
593 start. The initial proceedings are undertaken by the women on both sides. The groom's mother or a female relative of his mother's generation or older visits the mother of the prospective bride and tells her of her son's intention to marry the latter's daughter. The bride's mother then discusses the matter with the girl's father who has the
[429] final say in the matter. If the father is dead, then the authority on giving the girl in marriage goes to her brother or closest male kin in the order specified before. The girl has no say in the matter of marriage and cannot refuse to complete the marriage, although after marriage she can resort to a certain practice which helps her to terminate the marriage without the consent of her guardian, as will be seen later in
584 the chapter. From this moment until the conclusion of the marriage
[583] negotiations are done by the men of both families. The first thing to be discussed is the amount of bridewealth, a "mahr." If the two families agree on the marriage, a small ceremony is held. This ceremony is called
[779] "el-fatha" in reference to reading the first "sura" of the Koraan known as el-fatha, or "the beginning." The ceremony includes members of the
[675] two families and very few friends. After the fatha is read, the agreement is achieved. This is considered as an engagement and means that the girl is spoken for and therefore no other man can ask to marry her.

To break the fatha agreement, the father of the prospective bride

583 Among Awlad Ali the payment of the bridewealth signifies the com-
[584] pletion of the marriage contract. The mahr is not paid to the woman but
583 to her father or closest male kin. Usually the mahr is paid in money.
178 This, however, seems to be a recent phenomenon. Until the turn of the century, according to informants, the mahr was paid only in sheep and
583 goats. The practice is still followed by a number of tribal segments
178 of Ali Ahmar who occupy the western most part of the area where pasture
184 is more abundant and reliable and where the permanent pasture of the green mountains of Cyrenaica is close by. Other tribal segments still insist that at least one-fourth of the mahr should be paid in livestock,
583 but the majority of the people accept money. The main purpose of the
[584] mahr among Awlad Ali is to legalize the marriage contract and to put
[182] emphasis on the reciprocal oblications that the marriage created between the two families of the bride and the groom. It also works as an insurance for good behavior on the part of both the husband and the wife.
583 If the husband mistreats his wife or fails to give her the rights legally
593 hers by marriage, he risks the chance of losing the mahr and being forced
586 to divorce her. On the other hand, if the wife fails to behave in the customary way expected from a wife, the husband could divorce her and have the right to get back his mahr. This is particularly inconvenient in cases where all or part of the mahr is paid in livestock, in which case it becomes part of the father's herd and hard to take away in case of divorce. It is therefore in the interest of her family to keep the marriage. In this way their interference in the marriage is checked.
[591] This is especially important among Awlad Ali where, although the mar-
[592] riage is usually patrilocal, the woman retains membership in her father's household even after marriage.

593 As a girl in her father's household, the woman is under the direct authority of her father, who is responsible for her. When the father dies, this responsibility, as well as the authority, goes to her brother or her closest male kin in the order specified earlier. At marriage the [591] [606] girl usually moves to live with her husband, and this subjects her to his control and sometimes to that of his parents, if the couple lives with them. But the authority of the husband over his wife remains 593 secondary to that of her father. The woman's membership in her father's 594 household does not cease with marriage, and the strength of her relations to her kin is maintained by their frequent visits to her new residence and by her occasional visits to them. This right of visitation 593 cannot be denied by the husband who not only has to allow such visits, 594 but is also required to treat members of his wife's family, especially 606 her father, with great respect and hospitality. If the husband fails [586] to do so, the wife's father can order her to leave her husband and go back to his household with him.

This point is illustrated by the case of Muftah from the Esheibat tribe in the area of Matruh, whose older daughter is married to Hemeida from the Geneishat segment, which lives in the area of Fokah some 80 miles to the east of Matruh. One winter day in 1965, while passing near the area where his daughter lived, Muftah decided to pay her a visit. When he arrived, her husband was not at home; he was in the market in a nearby town selling sheep. When he came back late that evening, he greeted Muftah with the customary slaughter of a goat and invited the neighbors to the occasion. After dinner Muftah wanted to rest. It was a very hot night, so his son-in-law brought a rug and spread it outside the tent in the cool air. After that he retired to his tent where he spent the night inside.

593 spent the night inside. In the morning Muftah ordered his daughter to
574 pack her clothes because she was to leave with him. He refused to give
606 her husband any explanation as to why he was taking his daughter away.
586 The husband could not prevent him from taking her away because, as he said, "He is her father and has the right to take her away with him at any time."

When the wife did not return for two weeks, her husband went to her father's house to take her, but her father refused to let her go. Hemeida
593 then went to a religious man in the area and asked him to intervene in
574 the matter and see why Muftah had taken away his wife. He also asked him
606 to arrange a mi'ad with Muftah to discuss the matter.
586
627
792 The religious man was selected in this case because he was a close friend of Muftah and was believed to have influence over him. He was also known throughout the area to be fair and of sound opinion. It is important in the cases of disputes that the person selected as a mardi is known as a wise and fair man. It is only then that he is able to mediate between the two parties without being accused of taking sides.
792 The religious men, members of the Murabiteen tribes in the area, by their
619 relative position outside the formal tribal organization of the Sa'adi
627 tribes, are the most likely candidates for such activity. Yet, this is
554 not always the case. For this aspect of assumed impartiality is frequently balanced off by the fact that these religious men lack the support of a powerful tribal segment behind them. To be effective, the mardi has to be respected, not only for his personal qualities, but also for being a member of a respectable tribal segment whose power lends authority to the mardi's decision. This is not usually the case with the client
000 tribes of Murabiteen. Wealth in many cases is also considered an important

Wealth in many cases is also considered an important requirement for the selection of the mardi. This does not mean that religious men in the area have no role in dispute settlement, for they do. It simply means that the mardi is selected according to a number of criteria that vary from case to case, and that in some of these cases sound wisdom and fairness characteristic of religious men are not enough basis for their selection as mardis. This means that the religious men have no special mediatory role based on their religious nature alone. In certain cases religious men offer the best possibility for mediation; in others, a non-religious person might offer a better chance for settling the dispute. In cases of women seeking divorce from their husbands, the wealth of the mediator, more than anything else, seems to determine the selection of the man whom the woman asks to negotiate on her behalf, a point to which I will return later in the chapter.

The Mi'ad was held in the house of Muftah. Present at the mi'ad were Muftah, his son-in-law, Hemeida, the heads of households in Muftah's camp (one of them was his brother and the other five were members of different tribal segments), my driver (who was a member of the neighboring Sanagrah tribal segment), myself, and the religious man. After the tea was served, the religious man said that the discussion should start. He reminded the gathering that this case is a family one and should not develop into a larger dispute. "After all, the daughter's husband is a son, and the case is actually a misunderstanding between a father and a son and should be viewed in that context." Then he turned to Muftah and said that in that spirit he was asking him why he had taken his daughter away from her husband. Muftah said that he had taken his daughter away

Muftah said that he had taken his daughter away
593 to punish Hemeida for what he thought was disrespectful behavior. He
504 then proceeded to descirbe how Hemeida, after bringing the blanket out
606 for Muftah, went inside and spent the night with his wife, defying the
586 basic rule of not showing intimacy in the presence of older people,
627 especially the parents or parents-in-law. For, to show such intimacy
792 is a sign of disrespect. He demanded that Hemeida pay him "kabara"
888 for his injured pride. The term kabara refers to the adjective "kebir"
[681] (lit. respected or big man). Kabara is the fine paid for belittling
[558] someone by word or deed. Muftah insisted that he would not allow his daughter to return to her husband until Hemeida had paid that kabara. Hemeida conceded the fact that intimacy constitutes an insult; but he insisted that his action did not constitute an act of intimacy with his wife, but was a matter of convenience and necessity, since he had only
593 two blankets, and the only one left was that inside the tent. Muftah
504 became angry and started shouting at Hemeida, who, in turn, started
606 shouting back; it became impossible to follow what was being said.
586 The religious man interfered in the discussion, trying to stop the argu-
627 ment between Muftah and Hemeida. The others attending the mi'ad also
792 interfered. The religious man and two neighbors took Muftah outside
[578] the tent while Muftah's brother tried to calm Hemeida down. The other members of the group also calmed Hemeida, reminding him that he was the younger person and must be more tolerant of older people. They also reminded Hemeida that Muftah was his father-in-law and had the right to take his daughter away any time he chose. They urged him to "defeat the devil"
[681] and to apologize to his father-in-law and pay him kabara. He seemed convinced but insisted that all he was going to pay was five pounds and a goat. Muftahs brother and one of the neighbors then left the tent and

593 went to see Muftah and his company. Half an hour later the religious
594 man came and took Hemeida aside and talked to him in a very low voice,
606 then left the tent again. A few minutes more had passed; everyone re-
586 turned to the tent; Muftah was not angry anymore. The religious man
629 read the fatha, or the beginning sura of the Koraan, then said that the
792 souls were now pure and that Hemeida was considered as a son of Muftah
[779] and that disagreements such as this should not alter the good relations between the two. He said that the devil had found his way into the souls of the two people, but now, thanks to God and the good people present, they both had come back to their senses. Hemeida then rose and went to where his father-in-law was sitting and shook hands with him. Then he
[281] handed the religious man ten pounds which the latter passed to Muftah and promised to send him a goat as a gift to his daughter. Muftah left the tent and went to the tent of the women. When he came back he announced that a goat had been slaughtered and that everyone was invited to eat. Everybody then left and Muftah promised to return his daughter to her husband the following day.

593 While the right of the father to take his daughter away from her
606 husband constitutes a check on the authority of the latter and insures
557 the wife good treatment by her husband and her in-laws, not infrequently
586 that right has been invoked for personal or individual interest on the
[429] part of the woman's father or her closest male kin. Several cases have been cited in the area where the father or guardian had invoked the right to force the husband to concede to certain demands of the wife's guardian, even when the wife objected to those demands or disagreed with her guardian. One of these is the case of Mabroka who is married to a distant

593 606 557 586 member of the same tribe. At the time that the dispute had occurred she had been married for fifteen years and had four children ranging in age from thirteen to two years. The husband possessed a piece of land on the coast where a few olive and fig trees were growing. The husband, Mukheimer, made no use of either the land or the trees. Then, in 1966, the father became employed by the government organization in the area where his daughter and her husband lived and where the land was. He asked his son-in-law to give him the right to use the land for one pound a year. Mukheimer, who at that time worked part-time for the same government organization as a driver, refused. The reason was that his job with the government made it possible for him to apply for a power pump to be installed over the Roman well that existed on the land, and he intended to utilize the land himself. All attempts to convince Mukheimer to let him use the land failed. Then one day Mukheimer came back to his tent to find that his father-in-law had taken his wife and the youngest child and left the other three children with the second wife. The father-in-law told the second wife to inform Mukheimer that if he wanted his wife and child back, he had to think about the land he wanted to take possession of. Mukheimer tried to discuss the matter with his father-in-law, buth the latter refused to see him. After a month there were rumors that the daughter was not happy that her father had taken her away from her husband and children and that she wanted to go back to her family. She asked a number of people to help her, including myself, since her father was one of my informants at that time; but he insisted that the only way Mukheimer could have his wife and child back was by giving him the rights to the land. Mukheimer, on the other hand, threatened to divorce his wife and marry another woman if his father-in-law did not return his wife.

593 606 559 586 [114] The case persisted for more than two months with no sign that either party was willing to give into the demands of the other. I left the area before any solution to the case was achieved.

584 578 606 Another relevant case is one which involved a dispute between Hassan Hassanein from the Sanagrah tribe and the father-in-law of his daughter who was also from the same tribe and who lived in the same area. The case started when Hassanein was visited by a friend from the [574] Esheibat tribe in Matruh, an old man of 60 or 70 years. During the night that this guest spent at Hassanein's house, they got to talking about marriage and the fact that although his guest was a wealthy and re- [575] spected man, he had only one wife. After a lengthy talk, it seemed that the old man was convinced that he should have a second wife and asked Hassanein if he knew of a suitable girl to marry. Hassanein sug- 584 gested his daughter's sister-in-law. Hassanein took the prospective 583 groom to the tent of his daughter's father-in-law and discussed the 578 matter with the father of the prospective bride who agreed to marry his 606 daughter to Hassanein's guest if he paid the sume of 200 pounds, in addition to slaughtering a number of goats and presenting him with the [577] appropriate presents. When the man agreed to the terms, the fatha was read to signify the agreement between the two parties. Hassanein left the man to spend the night in the camp of his future in-laws. In the morning the groom told the bride's father that he must go to nearby Alexandria to bring the money for the bride price. When he came back late that afternoon, he paid the money and set a date for the wedding the next Thursday and then left for Matruh to prepare for the arrival of the new wife.

593
586 Taking his daughter away from the marital residence is treated as an undisputed right of the father. This is true whether he is justified in his actions or not and whether the girl approves of her father's decision or not. The general view is that the father, having raised his daughter, is entitled to her obedience and that taking her away from her husband, even against her will, is the symbol of authority over her. It also signifies that the girl has someone to look after her, to protect her and prevent the husband or any member of his family from mistreating her. Awlad Ali differentiate, however, between cases in which the father has exercised his right in an arbitrary and unreasonable manner and those in which he has reasonable grounds for his actions. A father is considered justified in taking his daughter away if her husband or members of his family fail to fulfill their obligations towards the wife or members of her family. Mistreatment of the woman (the definition of which will be discussed later), and disrespect to members of her family, or preventing her from visiting her family or them visiting her in the customary specified manner are always justifiable grounds. As a
[681] justifiable action, the father is not obliged to return his daughter until he gets full apologies and any gifts for the woman or himself that he considers as kabara. If the husband refuses to concede to the demands of the father, the latter can force him to divorce her without having to return the bridewealth to the husband. Although the father's right still exists when no justifiable grounds are present, in this case he is required to return his daughter to her husband after a short period. If he refuses,
[681] the husband is entitled to ask for a kabara. He also can divorce his
[583] wife and is entitled to get back his mahr and possible all the marriage expenses. It is this possibility of having to pay back the mahr and

593 and expenses to the husband that constitutes the most important check
586 on the otherwise undisputed right of the father to take away his
(583) daughter.

593 The woman, on the other hand, cannot refuse to go with her father,
562 for this means that she would be disobeying him. A woman who disobeys
586 her father is not worthy of his name. He can cut her off from the family, which means that she is left without any support or protection. A woman who is cut off from her family is left vulnerable to her husband and to society. She will have nobody to defend her or to be responsible for her actions. The responsibility for the woman's behavior is not transferred by marriage to the husband or his family.

682 If the woman kills or assaults someone or causes damage to property
683 for which compensation is required, her male kin pays the blood money or
602 the compensation on her behalf. It is sometimes stated that if the woman
613 has grown-up sons, they, and not her family, pay for her. Since the
562 children belong to their father's family, it may seem like transfering
593 the responsibility for the woman's actions to her husband's family. However, in all three cases where this happened, the woman was quite old, her father was dead, and her brothers were either dead or had moved outside the area and had cut off all relations with the area. She also had no nephews in the area. In such cases, the sons were the woman's closest male kin.

682 On the other hand, if the woman is the victim of murder or assault
683 for which blood money or compensation is to be paid, the husband is the
593 one to benefit from the situation. To understand why this happens, we
562 have to consider the contractual nature of marriage among Awlad Ali. It
584 has been mentioned earlier that before marriage is final, the prospective
583

584 husband or his father pays the woman's father the bridewealth, or mahr.
583 In exchange for the mahr, the husband expects his father-in-law to outfit his daughter with such items as rugs, blankets, and a few other household items, like cooking pots, serving dishes, and a metal or wooden chest [422] to keep her clothes in. These items become the private property of the wife, but the husband has the right to use them. In addition, the man 581 expects to gain certain rights to the woman. The customary law of 671 Awlad 585 Ali gives the husband three basic rights over his wife: the right to her sexual services (including the right to bear him children); the right to her labor in domestic activities; and the right to her obedience. Of the three rights, the first is the most exclusive. Not only doesthe husband have a complete monopoly over his wife's present sexual services, but he also has the right, if the girl has never been married before, to be the [583] first to use such services. If he discovers that she is not a virgin, he can send her back to her father and get back his mahr.

581 The other two rights are not as exclusive. The husband's right to 585 his wife's domestic labor does not prevent her from occasionally helping 593 out in her father's or brother's household, especially if they live nearby. Finally, the husband's right to be obeyed by his wife is always subordinated to that of her father, who retains the ultimate authority over his daughter.

582 If the woman is killed or injured, the husband is deprived of all 683 or some of her services, depending on the seriousness and the permanence 581 of the injury, and therefore is entitled to compensation. The right of 585 avenging the woman's murder remains, however, that of her family, since 593 she is still a member of that family.

684 The contractual nature of marriage is most clearly manifested in
613 the case of the wife's adultery. Since the woman belongs to her ag-
562
593 natic group, her behavior has direct effect on the honor of that group.
It is, therefore, the responsibility of her closest kin to keep an eye on her. If the woman commits adultery, it is her father or her male kin who is supposed to avenge the honor of the family by taking drastic actions, including killing, against the adulteress and/or her partner. But the marriage usually takes the woman away from the close watch of her family and puts her under the supervision of her husband who becomes entrusted with the duty of guarding her, and therefore partially responsible for her action. His responsibility is enhanced by the fact that although the wife's behavior does not affect him or his family, it has a definite effect on the honor and reputation of his children (Abou-Zeid, 1965).

684 The gravest insult that one can direct to a person in the area is
578 to describe his mother of being of disrepute. In their joking relations,
562 young men usually refer to eachother's father as being a dog or a theif
593 or a cheat, but none could refer to the mother. A woman of questionable
[522] reputation affects the reputation of her family in general and her children in particular. Any reference to the mother in the form of an accusation is supposed to be cleaned only by blood. Not only does this apply to the woman's voluntary behavior, but also to her physical and mental
[734] condition. If a woman loses her mind, the news is usually kept a secret,
684 especially by her children. The responsibility for retaliation in the
613 case of adultery, then, is divided between her nearest kinsman and her
562 husband. This gives both sides a vague and undetermined right of re-
593 venge. This division of the right of revenge explains the infrequency

of drastic actions taken in cases of adultery. Of the fourteen cases of adultery that I examined furing my field work, none resulted in the killing of the adulteress, and only three resulted in the murder of her partner. In all three cases where the adulterer was killed, the avenger was the husband; and in all three cases, the husband had to pay the bloodmoney to the murdered man's kin group. His payment of the bloodmoney, among other things, may indicate that the right of the husband to kill the adulterer is not completely accepted among Awlad Ali. All agree, however, that such killings never result in blood feuds because of the shameful circumstances in which the victim dies.

It was very difficult to obtain any detailed or reliable information about adultery cases. All the above mentioned fourteen cases were gathered from the informants, twelve of which were cases which had already been solved. For the two cases which were still open at the time of the study, information was quite vague. Usually such cases are conducted with a great amount of secrecy, with the involved parties referring to them as cases of theft, or merely by saying that the cases involve women. Only when the adultery leads to the killing of the adulteress or the adulterer are more details publicly known about the case.

But while the right to retaliate for the shameful action of an adulterous wife is vague and diffused, the right of the husband for compensation from the adulterer remains clear and undisputed. In this resepct, adultery is treated very much like theft; the adulterer has stolen the husband's exclusive right to his wife's sexual activities. The compensation for this offense is estimated at L.E. 20, in addition to the mahr, if the husband decides to divorce his wife as a result of her adultery.

681 this variation is that committing the adultery within the camp of the
558 husband constitutes a greater humiliation, since it affects his honor
684 among his neighbors. Also, adultery inside the tent of the couple carries with it the possibility of rape, while adultery outside the tent at least implies an element of consent on the part of the wife. The
[583] penalty in the case of adultery is the return by the wife's father of the mahr and all other expenses of the marriage ceremony and the gifts the husband had presented during the engagement period. This is a further indication that the father of the wife is still responsible for her behavior even after she is married. It is in this respect that the crime of adultery differs from theft. In the case of theft, the
[685] thief has to return twice the amount stolen and in the case of repeated offenders, four times the amount stolen. This is in addition to a certain amount of money as kabara. Yet, in the latter case the kabara is not specified and is subject to the proof by the victim that the theft constituted an insult to him. This insult is assumed in the case of adultery, which makes the kabara in the case of adultery part of the punishment--an integral part of the punishment. The kabara is not among
[613] the collective responsibility of the amar and is paid only by the person involved, unless he is totally unable to pay or refuses to pay. In such
426 cases, his closest male kin (his father, son, or brother) pays on his
• 593 behalf with the understanding that such payment constitutes a debt which
681 should be repaid. The person paying on his behalf in this case can go
684 to his tent and take by force anything of value, such as blankets, uten-
558 sils, or even sheep and goats, and keep them as pawns until the debt is paid.

581 Marriage does not deprive the woman of some rights of her own.
585 The customary law gives the wife three basic rights corresponding to
562 those of the husband's sexual services, domestic work, and obedience.
671 Corresponding to the first of these, the wife has the right to have a normal sexual life with her husband. This right, however, is not an exclusive one, since the husband can marry more than one wife. A woman
585 can be divorced from her husband without having to return the mahr if
586 she claims that the husband is unable to perform his sexual duties. In
593 such cases, the marriage is usually dissolved quietly. In certain rare instances, the husband may deny his wife's accusations. If both insist
585 on their stand, one or both may ask to be submitted to "bait el-shana'a,"
586 or house of the dreadful deeds. Reports are extremely vague about the
593 exact procedures involved in this case. Some informants stated that the
627 married couple would live in a tent without sidewalls so that everybody could see what goes on inside. Most informants, however, insist that it merely means that the couple move their tent near that of a respectable man whose word is believed and honored. This man is supposed to keep a close watch on the couple's activities, by listening or looking through holes in the tent. His verdict determines the future of the marriage.
(583) If the wife is justified in her claim, the husband is forced to divorce
(681) her and to forfeit his mahr. If, on the other hand, the verdict is for
(558) the husband, he not only can divorce her and get back the mahr, but is also entitled to kabara, or compensation, for his injured pride. There
(114) is no case of bait el-shana'a in the area during the time of the field
(178) work, and most people insist that this practice is something of the past
(583) when the mahr was relatively high and was paid in livestock, in which

case its return to the husband would have caused great financial inconvenience for the wife's family.

Corresponding to the second right, the husband's right to his wife's domestic work, is the wife's right to maintenance. The husband has to support his wife. This includes providing her and her children with adequate food and proper clothing. If the husband fails to do so because of poverty, sickness, crop failure or unexpected disaster, the wife's brother or father provides her and her children with the necessary food and clothing. If the husband's failure to fulfill his duties is due to neglect, the wife can leave him and go to her father or brother who talks the matter over with the husband who, in turn, either agrees to their demands or has to divorce his wife and forfeit his mahr.

Finally, corresponding to the husband's right to his wife's obedience is the wife's right to fair treatment by her husband. There are a number of ways in which the wife is mistreated. One is excessive punishment; although the right of the husband to punish his wife is provided in the Koraan, the punishment must be excessive or severe. Awlad Ali drav a line between acceptable and severe punishment. A punishment is severe if it results in something that other people can see or hear. If the husband insults his wife or her family and others hear the action, or if he beats her and this results in visible traces, then the punishment is severe.

A wife considers herself mistreated if the husband, when married to more than one, treats any of the other wives better than he treats her. Although the wife cannot deny her husband the right to have additional wives, he must give them all equal treatment. This includes

593 providing them with the same kind of food and clothing.* It also in-
595 cludes dividing his time equally between them, spending one night in
562 each wife's tent. The first wife, being the chief one, has certain privileges: her tent is the guest house, food is brought to her residence, and she is the one to divide it among the other wives, and her house is the place for the husband to stay if he becomes sick and unable to move every night from one tent to another. Other than the exceptions given to the first wife, the husband has to treat all his wives equally.

593 Normally, such cases of mistreatment do not result in divorce un-
(586) less they are persistent. In most cases, if the wife is mistreated, she goes to her father's or brother's house or sends for them to come and
593 take her. For the husband to bring her back to his tent, he must pay
431 her "nasafa." This is a gift given by the husband to his wife as an acknowledgement of guilt and as a form of apology for not giving her fair treatment. In some cases the nasafa is equal to what the husband originally paid as mahr.

581 These are some of the rights that marriage gives both men and women
585 in the tribal society of Awlad Ali. These rights, however, are useless
626 unless they are backed by certain means of enforcing them. The husband's
586 rights are guaranteed by his ability to dissolve the marriage at will.
626 According to Islamic law, a man can divorce his wife by simply pronoun-
593 cing the sentence "I divorce you" in the presence of credible witnesses.
[979] No justification for divorce is demanded from the husband according to
(562) the Koraan. No such privilege is given to the wife. She can obtain a

---

* With provision for wives with more children.

586 626 593 [562] [774] divorce only under specific circumstances in the absence of which the husband can force her to live with him. Following the Koraanic rules, Awlad Ali give men the right to dissolve the marriage at will and without any necessary justification; however, they differentiate between cases where divorce is justified and those in which it is not. In a case of justifiable divorce, the husband can take back the mahr and possibly all other marriage expenses. In the case of unjustifiable divorce, the husband forfeits his right to regain the mahr. Divorce is justified whenever one or more of the husband's rights are violated by the wife or members of her family. Not all degrees of violation are considered as justification for divorce, however. Only intolerable violations can be considered as such. In deciding whether or not an act constitutes an [183] intolerable violation, Awlad Ali judge it against the standard of the reasonable man, the customary man, and what he would have tolerated in a similar situation.

586 183 554 What constitutes reasonable behavior does not only vary according to the situation and the manner in which the actions are taken, but also with the relative position in the social structure of the parties involved and their initial relations to one another. In the case of divorce, what constitutes grounds for justifiable divorce in one case may not be sufficient grounds for justifiable divorce in another. In one of 586 183 554 511 [44] the cases I witnessed during the year of study, a man who divorced his wife because of her insistence that he buy her meat from the market every day of the week, was forced to forfeit his right to redeem the mahr on the basis that the wife's actions had not established a basis for justifiable divorce. In the negotiations that followed, the position of the husband, as well as that of the family of the wife, were discussed.

his wife. The husband agreed but insisted that she pay him L.E. 300 (this included the mahr and the marriage expenses). The Omda tried to reduce the amount but could not. He then tried to get the father to pay, but the father refused. He had to pay the husband L.E. 200 of his own money and promised that the rest would be paid when the woman remarried (it would be paid from the mahr). The husband divorced Haida. One week later she was married to her lover. I have no information about whether or not the 100 pounds was paid.

In another example, Sabha was forced by her father to marry her cousin (ibn 'amm). She could not live with him, so she threw herself on one of the holy men in the area. The holy man convinced the husband to divorce Sabha and then went to her father and convinced him to pay back the mahr to the husband, and the case was settled. People say that both the husband and the father agreed to the demands of the holy man because they were afraid of his supernatural curse. Sabha went back to her father's house.

It is obvious from these and similar cases that the success or failure of the procedure depends on the careful selection of the man on whom a woman throws herself. It is also apparent from the above examples that his right of refuge is resorted to only in cases where the woman cannot go to her father or to her closest kin to help her get a divorce because he is either unable or unwilling to help her. A father is unable to help if the husband is powerful or if he is the woman's ibn 'amm (father's brother's son) who has, according to the tribal law, the undisputed right to marry his bint 'amm (father's brother's daughter). The father is usually unwilling to help his daughter if he is the one

who forced her to marry the husband, or if she was cut off from the family for some reason or another.

From the frequency of women using this right in the area, it seems that no social disapproval is associated with it, nor is there a social stigma attached to women who throw themselves. They seem to find it as easy to find a husband as those women divorced voluntarily by their husbands or with the help of their fathers. In fact, as was mentioned earlier, many of them marry the rich men over whom they throw themselves. As to the amount of mahr paid for their subsequent marriages, the fact of throwing themselves does not seem to be a factor in determining the amount of mahr paid. In one of the cases, the woman threw herself on an 'aqila of one of the Geneishat tribe after her father refused to help her get a divorce from her husband who had married a second wife without first asking the first wife's permission. When the Geneishat member succeeded in convincing the husband to divorce his wife, the latter had no place to stay so remained in the house of her protector who acted as her guardian in place of her father who had refused to take her back in his home. While staying in the house of her protector, she got many marriage offers; one of the suitors offered a mahr of L.E. 4,000 ($10,000), one of the highest mahrs reported in the area. She agreed, and the marriage was affected. This mahr is about ten times the mahr she got for her first marriage. This procedure offers the woman a considerable guarantee of her marital rights. It also gives her, as far as the ability to dissolve the marriage, a status close to that of her husband. This relative equality is reflected is reflected in the lack of stigma associated with divorced

586 562 women in the Western Desert, and that the women usually have no difficulty in finding another husband.

586 562 593 768 While the right of "throwing herself" offers the wife some guarantee of her rights, her main guarantee is derived from the security she gets from retaining membership in her father's family. After the death of the father, the woman's claims extend to the households of her brothers. She acquires in them the same rights she had in her father's household, and the brothers take the responsibility of their father in protecting and defending their sister. The woman achieves this continuation of support partially through forfeiting her rights of inheritance to her brothers. [428]

562 428 [199] Awlad Ali recognize the right of the daughters to inherit in their father's estate. They accept the system of inheritance specified in the Koraan which gives the woman half the share of her brother. In practice, this is usually side-stepped. Only sons inherit their father's property. The justification given for the non-inheritance of women is that the main items of inheritance in the Western Desert, livestock and the right of land use, require certain protection and care which are beyond the culturally defined roles of women. Livestock require moving from one grazing ground to another, almost always crossing tribal lands belonging to various tribal segments, some of whom might be hostile. It also requires the ability to protect the herds from predators and from raids, especially in earlier times. Similarly, land requires preparation and protection against trespassers, especially when the barley is growing. [233] [311]

562 428 593 Women, however, are supposed to be compensated by their brothers for their shares. But very few would actually ask their brothers for

such compensation. In forfeiting her rights of inheritance, a woman secures for herself and her children the continuous support of her kin-group and the protection of her rights. This support was denied in the few cases I was able to collect in which the woman demanded her share of inheritance. The following is one of these cases. The material presented is a summary of the life history of Fatma, who at the time of the study, was a shopkeeper managing the small general store she owned near the railroad station of Burg el-Arab, some fifty miles west of Alexandria. She also practiced healing and midwifery on a part-time basis.

Fatma was the only daughter with four sons of sheikh El-Asi, who at one time was the aqila of bait Hussein of the Sanagrah tribal segment in the area. He was also known as a mardi and was frequently sought in mediation of disputes. He was believed to have supernatural power which he used to cure people for a certain amount of money. During his lifetime, he had acquired a sizable sum of money which he invested in livestock. At the time of his death his herd, which numbered more than 900 sheep and goats, was considered the finest in the area. He had no barley lands because his camp was deep in the desert, but he had fine grazing land.

Throughout the area the four sons were known for being arrogant and irresponsible. Three of them were employed by one of the irrigation projects carried on by the government in the area as construction workers; the fourth looked after the herd of his father. All four were known as chasers of women, and they frequently went to Alexandria to visit prostitutes and drink liquor.

Fatma was first married when she was eighteen to a man from Alexandria who had opened a general store in the area where her father

159 562 428 593 444 lived. Five years ago the husband died in a mining accident leaving Fatma with a ten-month-old boy. By that time, her father had been disabled, and her brothers wanted to manage her husband's store on her behalf. Knowing that her brothers were greedy, she refused and insisted that she take care of the store herself. The brothers objected on the grounds that it was not customary for a decent woman to be exposed to the customers in the store. When she insisted, the brothers threatened her. When the threats did not work, they beat her. After that, she [625] went to the police station in the area, filed a complaint against her brothers, and asked for police protection. The police officer in charge brought the brothers in and warned them that if they interfered with the store, not only would he arrest them, but he would also use his influence to get them forced from the irrigation projects where three of them worked. The threat worked, and they became friendly with their sister, buying things for the store whenever they went to Alexandria and sometimes helping in the store with her consent when she was on housecalls as a midwife. A year later Fatma was married for the second time to a 159 562 428 593 233 distant cousin; a few months later her father died. In a family meeting that followed the funeral, Fatma made her announcement that she was claiming her share of her father's herd. The brothers were angry and tried to [587] beat her. But the older members of the bait who were present at the meeting stopped them and told them that Fatma had all the right to claim her share of the inheritance according to Awlad Ali ways and that there was [578] nothing that they could do about it. She was characterized in that meeting as "bint haram" (illegitimate child), an insult used to refer to those who show selfishness in their kinship obligations. When she left the camp with her share of the herd, this seemed to have severed

159 the relationship between her and her brothers.
562
428
597 Following her action and until the time of the study, they had never visited her and she had never visited them. Her husband took
[237] care of the herd; and the arrangement worked out all right until the
159 husband told Fatma one day that he was going to marry a second wife.
562 She refused, but he went ahead with the marriage without her consent.
593
595 He brought the new wife to live with Fatma in the same tin hut in which they were living. He started to pay more attention to the new wife and to neglect Fatma; whenever the latter complained, he beat her. Then, before one of the religious feasts, he sold two of Fatma's sheep and bought his new wife a dress and a silver bracelet. When Fatma objected
[164] and they argued, he hit her with a stick on the head; she was hospitalized for a week with a serious head wound. While in the hospital, she went to her brothers who lived only two miles away, but they refused to
159 come to her assistance. She then went to sheikh Elewa (the aqila of
562 Bait Asabei) and threw herself on him. He met with the husband and con-
594 vinced him to divorce Fatma. He kept forty sheep of Fatma's herd as com-
593
595 pensation for the mahr he had paid her and the marriage expenses, then
586 took his new wife and moved from Fatma's hut. Fatma then returned and
159 managed her financial affairs successfully herself. She managed the
562 store and hired a shepherd to take care of the sheep. At the time of
444
[233] the present study she was respected by almost everybody in the area, including members of the local administration. She is known to be reason-
[829] able and of sound opinion, and her store functions as the meeting place
[524] for many of the tribal mi'ads and for casual conversations. She is also considered as a liason between the tribal population in the area and the local government administration, and is respected by both sides.

159
156
562
[428]
[573]
[83]
[625]

This apparently is not a typical case, nor is Fatma by any means representative of a typical tribal women. It is a case of a marginal woman who had revolted against the tribal definition of a female role. She violated the customary ways of her society and claimed her share of her father's inheritance; and by doing this, she forfeited her right to protection by her brothers. She was able to do this because of her marginality which enabled her to draw upon sources of protection outside the tribal pattern, the police. It is interesting to note here that by doing so, she was not totally eliminated or ostracized from her society; rather, her role was redefined as that of a man, and she was treated as such.

4: Peters E-5 (1948-1950) 1970 MT9 Libyan Bedouin MT9
Cyrenaica

173 178 551 613 428 [553] Fusion of names appears in another context and for similar reasons. Not only are lineal descendants given the name of deceased ancestors, but a man may be given the name of any deceased agnate of his tertiary section. Usually, this is only done when a man passes on property to another who is not his direct heir. Commonly, this occurs when an agnate is also a mother's brother, as often happens as a result of parallel cousin marriage, and this mother's brother has no sons of his own. If he has a sister's son, who is also his paternal nephew, he is likely to pass on his wealth to this nephew. A father, the Bedouin insist, ought [183] [593] to perform three duties for his sons: attend to their circumcision, and their education in the Koran, and provide bride-wealth when [852] [871] [583] they marry. All fathers attend to the circumcision of all their sons; few provide for the Koranic education of any of their sons; most bear the burden of marrying off at least one of their sons. The performance of the latter duty is what makes the continuance of the deceased's name an obligation, and whoever performs this duty must have his name perpetuated in one male offspring of the union which was brought about with his wealth. Wealth need not take the form of bride-wealth; it can be a legacy willed by a father, maternal uncle of the kind described above, or any other agnate who has died without male issue. Conversely, if a man dies without leaving any property, even his sons might not perpetuate his name, and eventually it will drop out of the genealogy.[10] There are instances of men inheriting the wealth of a number of agnates, using each parcel of wealth to make a new marriage and naming the sons of the various unions after the several dead who had left wealth. The example given below is taken from the genealogy of the Dawwas section of the Magharba tribe. What happened here was that the two lines stemming from Faraj and Sha'aban, after proliferating normally, became extinct. As this happened, Ibrahim, the son of Miftah, began to inherit wealth to which he was not a direct heir; and

[588] [10] To avoid confusion, it ought to be made clear that this is not ghost marriage. As I understand ghost marriages from Evans-Pritchard's (1951) account, two main conditions must be satisfied: (i) that there should be inherited wealth to make a marriage, and (ii) that the wealth remaining after the ghost marriage has been made is inherited by the ghost children only. In Cyrenaica, wealth thus inherited becomes part of a man's total wealth and is not reserved for a ghost marriage and its issue.

4: Peters E-5 (1948-1950) 1970 MT9 Libyan Bedouin MT9
Cyrenaica

582 613 [621] any summer camp will have descent lines cross linked by the bonds of marriage with parallel cousins, and at the same time cleaved by the maternal links established by repetitive cross-cousin marriage to different groups outside the segment. Thus, in one of its aspects, marriage makes of an agnatic group a group 582 613 of cognates as well. 'Marry your paternal cousins and both your paternal and maternal relatives will be one,' to quote Bedouin 602 sentiment on the matter. Within this agnatic group, nevertheless, two other clusters of kin exist—those with maternal connexions outside. In all, three areas of kinship can be defined,[13] although all the members of the segment will have the lineage bond of agnation in common. In normal circumstances, when split does not threaten the group, the bond of agnation, strengthened by parallel cousin marriage, takes precedence, although behaviour is significantly affected by maternal links at any time. There is, 152 in the first instance, great jealousy between co-wives, which is 595 passed on to their children. Each wife has her separate tent, and 593 each is entitled to a strictly equal share of the husband's time they have in common. This applies similarly to favours he may grant his wives, and the distribution of his wealth among them. If, for example, the husband is the owner of a horse, he is required to tether it outside the tents of his wives in strict rotation; if he retires for the night with one wife, the following night he must favour the other; if he buys dress material for the one he must buy a length of identical material for the other; if he bestows favours on the children of one the children of the other must be given equal consideration. Many such details are meticulously observed; but while many are observed most of the time, it is difficult to observe them all, the whole time. Any breach of the rules is quickly taken up by the wives, and quarrels ensue, leading not only to bitterness among the co-wives, but between the offended wife and her husband, between the children of both wives, and between the children and their father. Often, 595 when a man has co-wives, there is a marked discrepancy in age 593 between them, for, when an elderly Bedouin marries a second 561

[13] The situation is not always as simple as this. Cross-cousin marriage may take more than two directions, and marriage within the segment might bring about great complexity, but the argument put forward above is not seriously affected by neglecting these details here.

wife he usually chooses a young girl of about twenty years. Children of the elder wife might be adult, therefore, when the children of the junior wife are infants. Great emphasis is placed on seniority, particularly among males, but strong emphasis is also placed on the equality of siblings and their equal legal status. Between brothers of widely differing ages, there is, then, this field of potential conflict. From an early date competitive, if not hostile, relationships develop between the sons of co-wives. Competition between half-brothers results not only from their mothers being co-wives: one group might be the sons of a divorced wife. The latter situation is often much worse, for the sons born of the divorced wife are now being fostered by a woman who is not their mother. A similar condition of things is brought about when a widower with sons remarries. Yet again, when a wife grows old and her sons have reached maturity, her husband may not divorce her formally, but merely 'throw her off his back'; she will then go to live with her grown sons, while her husband, in turn, takes a new wife, usually taking up residence in another camp for a time at least. It would be too much of a digression here to discuss the inheritance disputes, and the disputes over marriage and bride-wealth, which arise out of these various circumstances. Suffice it to note that such disputes are common and affect the alignment of people within a tertiary segment.

As half-brothers grow to maturity some of them will marry their maternal cross-cousins, and in succeeding generations some of their descendants will do likewise. In this way, a tertiary segment united by the bond of agnation, will also have within it smaller groups of kin having different sets of cognatic links. This group, as a residential unit, shows a very high concentration of agnates, and the Bedouin say with pride that members of the camps are always 'one' because of this agnatic bond, and indeed, the corporate identity of this group is strikingly displayed in many circumstances. It does not take precedence in all circumstances, for, built into agnation, with the heavy burden of duties which go with it, are serious stresses and strains which in some circumstances regularly come out into the open. In yet other circumstances cognatic kinship affiliations appear to be dominant, causing friction among agnates. A man, for example, may permit

6: Peters E-5 (1948-1950) 1965 MT9 Libyan Bedouin MT9
Cyrenaica

Chapter

7

*Aspects of the Family Among the Bedouin of Cyrenaica**

E. L. PETERS
University of Manchester

Marriage and the Father-Son Relationship

When a marriage takes place among the Bedouin of Cyrenaica, a nuptial tent is set up some distance away from that of the groom's father. There is no particular significance about the nuptial tent itself, but it must be pitched at a distance so that the father "will not see it" — although, obviously, in a country of large level plains, it stands out conspicuously. This pretence that the tent remains unseen by the father is pushed to the point of his denying any knowledge of what is afoot. A middle-aged or elderly man with a family adopts a similar attitude to any marriage in which his son participates, as groom or as guest. An elder, the father of three unmarried sons (one of whom, in his late twenties, was known to be getting impatient about marriage), when I asked after his eldest son, insisted that he was away with the camels, although the son was conspicuous in a semicircle of young men encouraging a blindfolded maiden in the movements of her seductive dance outside a wedding tent in his full view. Prior to the wedding festivities, the

* I wish to express my gratitude to Mr. R. Werbner for reading this essay in manuscript.
The information presented is based on 27 months fieldwork carried out during 1948 to 1950, among the Cyrenaica Bedouin. I am indebted to the Trustees of the Horniman Studentship Fund, and the Committee for Treasury Studentships in Oriental Languages and Cultures, for making the research financially possible.

Cases

584 Prior to the wedding festivities, the
• 593 father will have participated in negotiations, although even in these he will have remained silent, leaving an affine, as a rule, to arrange the details with the girl's father and his kinsmen. The father feigns aloofness from the start of negotiations until after the wedding celebrations have ended. Before inquiring into this seemingly odd behaviour, a few further details of marriage ceremonies need to be mentioned briefly.

585 The bride is carried to the nuptial tent on a camel, seated in a cagelike
342 structure placed on the camel's back, this canopy covered over with carpets
[492] and at least one long blanket — later to be used to divide her tent into male and female quarters — which constitute part of the goods given to a woman
[788] on marriage. On her arrival, while she is still seated in her canopy, the camel is led round the tent seven times by a small boy. She then descends and is hustled into the tent by a number of women who make a show of their attempts to conceal her from view. Inside the tent the bride is enclosed in one corner in a kind of cubicle partitioned off by a length of blanket.

585 In the meantime, the groom has affected to escape, but is "caught," while
[533] running away, by his fellows, who "compel" him to return to the nuptial tent,
[831] to the accompaniment of their lewd songs telling of the sexual pleasures awaiting him. Much of this is horseplay, but the young men carry it out brazenly and the groom is required to show reluctance to continue with the ceremonies. His entry into the nuptial tent is marked by an expectant hush that falls over the crowd of men gathered, as they await the result of the virginity test the groom is about to perform, which he does by wrapping part of his toga round one of his fingers to pierce the hymen. Sharp shrieks from
[202] the bride give the signal that the test has been undertaken; not a stir moves the crowd until evidence of its success has been publicly displayed, which is given by the groom hoisting the blood-stained portion of the toga through the corner of the tent on a pole, followed by firing three shots from his rifle. Jubilantly, the men gathered fire volley after volley from their rifles just over the nuptial tent, and the seven-day celebrations begin.

585 A full descriptive account of a marriage, or many of the ritual details
589 woven into it need not be given here. What is included is intended to illus-
[593] trate certain relationships between father and son, and between one
[561] generation and another. In this connection two further points are appropriate. First, during the week of festival, young men gather outside the nuptial
[535] tent each night to encourage a maiden in her dancing, clapping their hands
[533] to the point of injury "so that we will have a wife soon." The celebrations belong to the bachelors, and they are the only ones to engage in the singing and hand clapping. It is they too who stop the bridal camel on its way to
[538] the nuptial tent to recite obscene rhymes to the bride, and they also shout
[831] their rather dubious consolations to the bride who, during the virginity test, crying out for her mother, is assured by them that the night holds promise
585 for her which her mother could never extend. The married men, particularly
602 the close senior agnates of the groom, stay away from it all, discussing mat-
521 ters unconnected with the affair.

Second, the fiction that nothing has happened, which characterises the father's behavior, does not cease with the termination of the celebrations. Each morning, soon after daybreak and before the camp is astir, the groom must leave his bride and repair to his father's tent to lie at his father's side "as he always had done in the past, as if he had not left him." This conventional ruse is followed, not just for the seven days of wedding festivities, but is continued after the groom has moved back into the camp proper, and pitched his tent alongside his father's, with the ropes of the two tents crossing.

In matters other than sleeping arrangements, this fiction that "nothing has happened" is maintained. Marriage does not mean the immediate creation of a wholly separate domestic unit. Save for the appearance of an additional tent, the ordinary run of daytime activities is scarcely altered. To mention perhaps the most important feature of the relationships between father and son, the groom continues to eat with his father. As yet, the son does not use his own bowl,[1] and may not, indeed, do so for several years. The important symbolism of "eating together" or "eating out of the one bowl," the act of commensality creating a bond of fellowship about which Robertson Smith[2] wrote so eloquently can only be referred to here in one of its many aspects. Bedouin themselves stress that eating together is a strong bond, and the communal meal is always used for this purpose after the settlement of a dispute, or at the conclusion of a blood-money agreement, and so on. It is significant also in the sense that those who partake of a meal accept the authority of the host; he becomes their protector, and a blow against one of them is struck at him also. Even if the guest is an enemy,[3] as long as he has eaten from another's bowl his life is safe.

The slaughter of an animal for another person creates a bond which has its roots in the intimate connection between man and his animals. In a very vivid way, the Bedouin view their animals as part of themselves, as part of their *Risiq*, their general wealth, in which their sons are included. It is this mystical association between a man and his animals which distinguishes a meal consisting of the meat of an animal slaughtered from ones' own flock or herd from a meal consisting of meat bought from a butcher's shop — often given by the plateau peoples of Northern Cyrenaica to their guests, but which the camel-herding Bedouin of the south regard as despicable hospitality. A slaughtered animal is the food, *par excellence*, which establishes this bond

[1] When Bedouin take their meals, they eat from large wooden bowls imported from south of the Sahara. It is a matter of custom that a man does not eat alone unless it is unavoidable, a custom of such strength, that, when, one day, only an elder, occupying a tent the ropes of which were crossed with mine, was left in camp, he brought his bowl into my tent "so that I will be eating with a man."

[2] William Robertson Smith. *The Religion of the Semites*. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan, 1927.

[3] A stranger entering a camp is under no obligation to give his identity. Few do so until they have partaken of a meal. In the past, the Bedouin claim, the period of anonymity could last for 40 days, but nowadays, they say they limit it to two only. I have known strangers enter a camp, receive entertainment, and leave without offering any specific identity.

between man and man, although the various cereal dishes which constitute their regular meals are said to have a similar effect.

The son who continues to eat with his father "as he always had been doing," also continues to accept his authority. Indeed he could do little else at this stage, for he lacks the economic means to cut away. Neither at marriage nor after is there any transfer of wealth from father to son. The new tent recently pitched is no more than a dormitory to which the young couple retire at night. During the daytime the son is still to be seen in his father's tent, and, in the male quarters, things appear to be much the same as before. In the female quarters, the only superficial change is the more frequent appearance among the women of one who, before marriage, often sat among them if she had been a close neighbour or a close cousin previously; or of an additional helper if she had come from afar. On the surface things remain "as they always have been," although in fact, a whole set of changes have been initiated.

Rites de passage are few among the Bedouin. A man's progress in life is ceremonially marked by only four events: his birth, circumcision, marriage and burial. His development into manhood is not marked by clearly defined stages. About the age of seven, the henna markings on the front of a boy's shirt for protection from the evil eye are not renewed, the cowrie shell stitched to the front of his cap as a kind of talisman against the evil eye is removed and he is no longer permitted free access to the women's quarters. As he grows older, he will be instructed in goat-herding, and later taught to follow the sheep. In his late teens he will have to undertake the more arduous and responsible task of herding the camels. Coincident with camel-herding, he may be given a gun by his father. Shortly afterwards he must undertake the stringent test of manhood, a journey to a distant oasis for dates. These changes are not marked off by a *rite de passage*. The rites a man undergoes during the course of a lifetime are minimal, and in the sense that they are concerned with only the basic events in a man's life anywhere (save for circumcision, which is a minor celebration anyway), they are irreducible. Moreover, the rituals which exist do not comprehend the same multiplicity of relationships as rituals which occur in many other African societies.[4] It is true that the ceremonies referred to in this chapter by no means include all the Bedouin rituals. It is also true that the events mentioned vary in elaboration, and in the number of symbols present in them, but they are not multiplied or reduced for different people.

In this context it is important to stress that we are here dealing with a lineage society where social differentiation is not built up into differences of rank, where the roles to which a man succeeds are almost wholly captured by his kinship relationships with other men and which are sociologically to be distinguished from the roles a man enters into by acquisition of office,

[4] See, for example, the elaboration of rituals discussed in M. Gluckman (Ed.), *Essays on the Ritual of Social Relations*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1962.

6: Peters E-5 (1948-1950) 1965 MT9 Libyan Bedouin MT9
Cyrenaica

membership of associations and so on. The statuses a Bedouin achieves depend not on an ordered acquisition through the inheritance of roles or election to them, but on his personal manipulation of linkages in his jockeying with others. Rites are minimal because there are few defined statuses an individual can predictably acquire. The equalitarianism of the desert denudes the Bedouin of ritual riches. Complimentarily, rites which do occur are thrown into exaggerated relief by the absence of others, and in their isolation, become not merely a "passage" but a cataclysmic change. Marriage and burial both comprehend limited fields of relations, but accompanying ceremonies may bring several hundred people together, people who otherwise rarely gather in these numbers to meet one another as kinsmen and neighbours, and it is suggested that the emphasis given to the events dramatises the significance of the changes they produce. In the discussion of the changes brought about by marriage, the Bedouin view of what is entailed will be considered first.

The Bedouin View of Marriage

After marriage, the Bedouin argue, a son has a tent of his own, a woman over whom he has authority and soon children to make him a father. Marriage causes split, branching. A new family is created, holding the potential of a new lineage. The separation is so painful a matter for the father that he cannot contemplate it, hence his pretence that he has no knowledge of wedding festivities, and his subsequent attitude that nothing has happened.

Interestingly, there are two other occasions when this attitude is to be observed. When a man kills within his corporate group,[5] he may flee his tribe or he may be compelled to leave; later he is likely to return and, when he does, he is received with a minimum of show. Every attempt is made to suppress knowledge of the event.

Again, if incest occurs, the memory of it must somehow be suppressed, and it is an ever-present danger. Men, permitted four wives simultaneously and also able to engage in a plurality of marriages through divorce or death of spouses, may have children showing an age difference of two or three generations. Thus it comes about that a man may be of an age in relation to his father's sister which permits them as children to behave as if they were first paternal cousins. As an adult, the preferred spouse for a man is a father's brother's daughter. In terms of relationships between adolescents the situation in which a man is of the same age generation as his father's sister is fraught with danger. In one such case, between a man and his father's sister, the male child of the union was put out in the desert to be

[5] Bedouin are disposed in groups which, in summer, usually constitute a single community, around or near a watering point. The men of this group are interlinked by reference to an ancestor four or five ascending generations, reckoning from the generation of men of about 20 years. When, elsewhere in this chapter reference is made to corporations, it will be to groups of this kind.

835 devoured by wild animals, the girl was "given"[6] to a close cousin who had
561 shot his sister. Both now reside with an enemy tribal section. The two acts
684 were equated. They were similar to the extent that both created a situation which defied institutional resolution. The culprits were exorcised. The girl's lover remains with his group — the odium for the male is incomparably less than for the female, since, while maternity is easy to establish, paternity is frequently shrouded in doubt — and during the months I lived with this particular group, there was never a mention of the affair. It was as if "nothing had happened."

829 If asked why these two events cause such profound distress, the answers
578 the Bedouin give are twofold: they can do nothing about them, and they
613 cause split. By split in this context they mean split in the lineage; split in the case of homicide because it may lead to a demand for blood-money which
[682] is payable only between corporations, and split in the case of incest because
[684] it causes chaos in relationships. Marriage, in one sense, their reasoning
581 runs, is similar, for it too causes split. Whatever may be the analytic strength
829 of the arguments that homicide and incest precipitate splitting, the argu-
613 ment that marriage does so is spurious. In what sense can marriage mean split? Bedouin men marry "so that we may beget many sons, to make a big lineage later on." The worst fate that can befall a man as a result of his son's marriage is that he, in later generations, will become the focal point in a series of branching descent lines. The alternative — that his sons remain unmarried — can only mean that his name would disappear through want of successors to carry it on, which is one of the greatest evils which can befall a man, according to Bedouin sentiment: better split than oblivion. If the key to the interpretation of the father's attitude to his son's marriage is not
581 that it causes split, it must lie elsewhere in their relationship. What mar-
585 riage does is alter the distribution of authority between father and son. In
•593 order to pursue this, it is necessary first to clarify the types of authority involved, and then assess them in a post-marital situation.

The Division of Authority Between the Family and the Corporation

554
851 Politically, a person's status is determined for him at birth. At this time a man has the right to accept or deny paternity. Denial is tantamount to an accusation of adultery by his wife. In practice, once a wife has given birth to a male child, whatever doubts people may harbour regarding paternity, the husband accepts the child as his. "The boy for the bed," is a saying often heard among the Bedouin; but it remains the husband's prerogative to invest the child with legitimacy, hence, political status. Only if a husband becomes
[839] aware that he is publicly considered a cuckold, or if he catches his wife and a lover *in flagrante delicto*, is he at all likely to take action. Otherwise he may

[585] [6] A marriage is illegal unless it is accompanied by an agreement to transfer wealth
[581] to the girl's father.

indeed welcome unfaithfulness on his wife's part. If a man is very old, and his wife very young, it is likely that she will entertain lovers; if a man leaves camp for a long absence his wife may not remain chaste. In both cases, if the liaisons lead to the birth of a child, particularly a male, the husband greets the news with unrestrained enthusiasm — "praise be to God," as their saying goes. Incapacity[7] to produce offspring, if a husband is convinced of it, may lead him to delegate a kinsman to serve his wife for procreative purposes: he has the legal authority, as husband, to do so, and to require his wife to submit, for the only alternative, if he is not to die without "issue," is to "take" a son from his brother and fulfill the obligations towards this boy required of a pater, namely, attend to his circumcision, provide him with teaching in the Koran (a duty neglected by most) and give him the wealth with which to marry.

Granting the acceptance of paternity, whatever the circumstances of conception, a male child, *ipso facto*, acceeds to membership of a corporation, and is subject to the authority of that group in a number of matters. In many situations it would appear that a son is under the father's political control. At a moot, the son, if he speaks at all, will do so only to corroborate his father. Discussions among men in a small camp evoke a similar pattern of behaviour. Until the father becomes senile or dies, a son cannot publicly pursue an independent course, but he desists by virtue of his relationships with his father *qua* pater, not because of his father's political power to coerce. All men of a corporation, in any event, "speak with one word" at a moot, and a son, by his assent to the common view, also supports his father; in so doing he yields to the political authority of his corporation, and not that of his father.

Membership in the corporation invests a man with other privileges and duties. Protection against external enemies comes within the corporation's jurisdiction, although in a particular situation, the father may well be the person who dispenses it. Complimentarily, if a man commits an offense against a person not of his group, whatever private thoughts his father may have about the act, the responsibility lies not on his shoulders but on the group, and he is compelled to share this responsibility equally with all other members. For example, if a son commits a homicide the father bears the same legal responsibility for the act, and is under obligation to contribute the same share of blood-money as he would be if the act had been perpetrated by any male of the group other than his son. Even in a narrower field of relations between father and son the group exercises its authority. Acting as pater, a man may punish his son, physically or otherwise; he may not do so to the point of injury, for personal injury comes within the legitimate sphere of the corporation. A man's "bone" belongs to his group; he is an in-

[7] Impotency is a special case, because it is dishonourable for a woman to remain wife to an impotent man. She cannot divorce him, but her father can insist on a witnessed test of impotency and, if it is proven, the husband is compelled to divorce her. Barrenness, obviously, is a different matter.

Cases

593 613 tegral part of "the one body"; events which affect a man in this context lie outside a father's field of jurisdiction. The political authority vested in a corporation acts to circumscribe the authority of persons in other fields.

Other rights stem from political membership. As a person with a defined position in a lineage corporation, a man has the right to use the natural resources of its territory. His father, although he instructs his son where to plough and when to water the animals, cannot deny him access to wells, pastures and ploughland. Economically, a son is independent to this extent, although his ability to exploit his right to the natural resources is restricted by his father's control of animals. Ultimately, however, this restriction cannot amount to stultification, because a man has the right to 613 422 735 demand food. In practice, a poor man staves off hunger with donations from this or that individual, and superficially it appears that he is dependent on the personal charity of his fellowmen. This is not so, for what is implicit is that the parcels of wealth controlled by individuals are the possessions of the corporation. It is not accidental that poor people do not go hungry. During my entire stay among the Bedouin I never saw one of them beg or [556] suffer hunger, however marginal the diet of many. Clearly, those with a surplus can and do use it for personal advantage, but the extent to which they can do so is circumscribed by the legal claims which members of a corporation have on the parcels of moveable property held by each of them.

613 421 428 Control over the wealth, whether it be animals or the procreative functions of women, rests, in the final analysis, in a corporation. Inheritance laws specify that women are not legal heirs,[8] and that all male children are [562] equal heirs. Women do, in fact, come to control property, and it is rare that [593] wealth is equally divided among male heirs. The precise details of inheritance may partly be decided by a father, but he is limited in his actions. Most of the time inheritance disputes are not of the kind which require action by the corporate group; a case which occured while I was resident with the Bedouin did, however, invoke immediate action. A man, who had left the desert to live in a village on the plateau, had only one daughter. He made it known that he intended to will his entire property to his daughter. When the news was brought to the camps of his fellow agnates, there was great consternation, because, as became clear in their lengthy discussions, the threat now existed that a substantial parcel of property would be removed from the group, a threat made real by the proposed marriage of the daughter [584] to a man of another tribe. The court would have to recognise the daughter's right to some of the property, and the members of the group reluctantly had to concede that there was little they could do about this, but they had one [593] action left to them — they decided that her nearest agnate should demand [584] her in marriage. Usually, the choice of husband for a daughter is a decision

[771] [795] [671] [8] The Bedouin are Sunni Muslims, and, as Samusi, belong to the Maliki school in legal matters. According to court law, women are heirs. However, actual Bedouin practice is contrary to law. For, if women were permitted to inherit, since many marry outside the corporation into which they were born, they could alienate its resources.

her father takes, but in certain critical situations he can be relieved of choice if the interests of the group as a whole are at stake.

Political authority is the preserve of a corporation, and its exercise leads to invasion of a man's authority in the field of domestic relations. This does not mean, however, that discrete areas of authority do not remain with the father. In the tent his authority over his son is so overwhelming as to keep the son in almost complete subordination. The son is referred to as a slave, and in daily life he has to behave as one. He must obey every command, for, were he to rebel, he would find little or no support among his agnates, whatever the extent of the provocation. Retreat from his father is hardly an alternative, since, while his father is alive, he has no animals of his own, and to leave camp would only mean that he would have to move outside his group to seek employment elsewhere as a shepherd. If he did this he would forfeit status, and almost certainly cut himself off from property which would fall to him after his father's death. A man who "denies" his father looses too many privileges for the practice to become widespread.

Caught in this dilemma, a son's predicament is worsened by the fact that he cannot initiate marriage negotiations — to be able to do so requires some animals to offer a girl's father. Through his mother's brother he has the means of bringing pressure to bear on his father, but the latter can resist for years. Finally, a marriage is arranged for him. It is difficult to convey the yearning of young Bedouin for marriage. They discuss it among themselves *ad nauseam*. For the most part their talk is about the sexual aspect of marriage. Premarital sex relations are strictly controlled, and the movements of each young girl are carefully guarded because, if on the day of her marriage the test shows that she is not a virgin, she not only brings disgrace to her family, but the marriage may be revoked and her worth as a bride for another man seriously diminished. Nevertheless premarital relations do occur, if not between youths and maidens to any extent, between young men and married women.

The question still remains: why is marriage the occasion of such ebullient celebration? The formal authority a father exercises over his son changes little on marriage. Economically the son is still harnessed to the father. The latter still shouts his orders at him, and obedience remains unaltered. Any sign of an independent view on a matter is met with a gruff rebuff. If the marriage turns out to be disagreeable to the father, he has the authority — if not always the power — to break it. Marriage does not mean a change in the general mode of behaviour between the two; the legal relations remain unaltered, albeit modified in practice, as the married son matures in age. But marriage does mean the acquisition of rights and status previously denied a son. Henceforward, he has a domain of his own. This is high drama, indeed, for although every effort is made to give substance to the expressed view that "nothing has happened," for the first time in his life the son has seized publicly, amid the jubilations of his fellows, a status which hitherto was the possession of the father.

Cases

The Meaning of Marriage

581 Until marriage the changes in a man's life have been in the nature of
585 an ordered sequence of development from a child to be cared for — the only
342 time in his life when a father, without inhibition, showers on him his love
• [593] and affection — to one who, by degrees, makes an increasing contribution to a production unit. Marriage necessitates that a man pitch a tent for himself. With a tent he becomes a potential host and protector of others. The local idiom for marriage is "to set up a tent." It would be quite improper to use
[196] the verb "to marry" when inquiring whether a marriage has taken place
[195] since this verb also has the meaning of "to have sexual intercourse." Instead the euphemism, "Have you pitched a tent?" is used. The Arabic word for a tent in this context is *Bait*. It is not used to refer to a military tent, nor to the small tent which shelters only a widow. It is reserved for the Bedouin tent, which usually has a wool top, and, most importantly, holds the promise of the continuation of life, whether it shelters a newly married couple, a mature family or young unmarried people. (The word *Bait* represents a complex concept, and it would be too much of a diversion here to discuss the various points of its significance. It is essential to understand that its
[178] meaning is not confined to a tent in the physical sense.) Its top has *Baraka* (divine goodness) in it; the quality of *Haram*, which makes it possible for the tent to be used as a sanctuary, is associated with it and this quality of *Haram* extends, moreover, to the ropes of the tent, so that anyone who clutches them comes under the protection of the owner. In it, the wife must permanently reside and her husband has the legal right to insist on this. In it too, he has the legal right of sexual access to a woman, his wife. Any children
[885] born in it he can claim as his own. With the erection of a tent the son reaches adulthood, and it is in this sense that he can be said to have acquired a domain of his own.

581 Marriage gives a son greater freedom and less dependence on his father
585 in another sense. A second euphemism used for marriage is "making a
[593] relationship," specifically an affinal one. Relationships between a man and
[195] his father-in-law are diverse and are used in various ways in different situations. Here, the particular aspect which needs to be stressed is that a man
606 can cajole his father-in-law, and (through his wife) wealth, in the form
425 of animals, may pass from the former to the latter. Reciprocal gifts are passed
556 between affines on certain occasions, but in addition small amounts may pass which are not connected with the formal occasions of exchanges. Debt
583 lies between them. It begins with the initiation of marriage negotiations,
584 when the suitor's kinsmen take a prescribed number of sheep to present to
606 the girl's father if negotiations are successful. They promise to transfer bride-wealth[9] to the girl's father. A few weeks after the marriage, the hus-

[191] [9] I use the word "bride-wealth" because it has become so familiar in the literature, but the only similarity between the *Sahiba* of the Bedouin and the bride-wealth of

6: Peters E-5 (1948-1950) 1965 MT9 Libyan Bedouin MT9
Cyrenaica

band is required to take gifts to his mother-in-law in recognition of the fact that she nourished his wife as an infant (the literal meaning of the word used for this gift is "milk"). A return visit is made and gifts are given to the daughter. When the first child is born an animal is presented by the affines, and if the child is a male, the gift may be several sheep, or even a few camels if the father-in-law is very wealthy. Formal exchange of gifts continue, but, in addition, informal transfers are made. Moreover, if relations between a man and his father-in-law develop favourably, it is not uncommon for a young husband, during the early years of marriage, to move away from his father and pitch his tent alongside that of his father-in-law. Marriage gives a son affinal relations of his own. Affinity can alleviate the dead weight of paternal authority.

It is suggested that the crisis the marriage of a son assumes for a father is the shift it entails in the distribution of authority. This is borne out by other details in the marriage ceremony referred to earlier. Ordinarily, young men dare not sing within earshot of their senior agnates. Far from allowing obscenities, agnates of the ascending generation would not allow even a mention of women to be made by young men, in their presence. In a group consisting of young men and an agnate, I chanced to use the noun for woman and immediately my tent was cleared of all but the senior agnate. At a wedding the young men revel in their lewd songs and shout their obscenities for all to hear. The senior agnates stand aside and make a show of ignoring the proceedings. And well they may, for each marriage is a challenge to the exclusive authority they have enjoyed; each nuptial tent is an invasion of the domain of which they have been undisputed masters. Marriage is the only occasion when the men of one generation can clap and sing their defiance of an older one, and give warning of the changes which must be accommodated however great the pretence that nothing has happened.

Marriage ceremonies dramatise the clash between adjacent generations over the distribution of certain forms of authority. If this authority is as overwhelming as has been suggested, and if it is so deeply resented, how is it that life is endurable for juniors? Relationships between junior and senior agnates are so restrictive that they almost amount to what Professor Fortes has suggested I view as a form of avoidance relationships. Juniors must always defer, they must obey commands promptly, they serve their seniors, they must accept a lead when it is given and the restrictions on conversations exclude all reference to women, marriage or sex. These are not simply a set of general guides for behaviour, they are rigidly applied rules, deviation from which is countered with rebuke or greater severity. It would appear from this

---

many African societies is that wealth is transferred. Obviously, in societies where the rules of exogamy compel a dispersion of links outside a man's own clan, what is involved in this transfer of wealth cannot be sociologically similar to one in which marriage to the first cousin on either side is permitted.

462 424 them or any innate aptitude for them; this insistence is an index of the jealousy with which she is prepared to guard her rights. Each right derived from this or that small task is an extension of her control over the male.

462 424 252 The force and significance of this control is, perhaps, best seen in a woman's right to cook. At marriage a woman must have at least the minimum of cooking utensils, and one of the rights a man acquires in a woman is that she cooks for him. This is something a man cannot do for himself. Therefore, when a man ill-treats his wife or threatens her with divorce, she [593] can retaliate by refusing to cook, or leave the tent altogether to return to her father. A man bereft of this service is in a very sorry plight indeed. The legal dominance of the male, seemingly autocratic, is reduced at every point by the control a woman exercises through her exclusive right to perform tasks. The limits to the area of her coercive powers are significant. They are confined almost wholly to domestic relationships. Legally, women 562 suffer such disabilities that they are almost of the status of minors; in reality, their day-to-day living is far from intolerable because they are able to control males over a wide field of relationships.

462 424 231 Men, excluded in the main from domestic duties around the tent, perform tasks to which their legal rights are tied. While women have access to wells for water used by human beings, the transport of larger quantities of water over longer distances, requiring the use of camels, is a task which falls to the men. Watering of animals is done by men. Only they can slaughter the animals for food. The meat of an animal slaughtered by a woman is not "free," in a ritual sense, for human consumption. In an extremity only, a woman can, in effect, kill an animal, but the knife which cuts its throat must be held in a male hand, even if it is the hand of a very 462 small boy. The exploitation of the land is also the male prerogative. They [424] plough and sow the grain; incidental help may be provided by wives working [241] alongside their husbands during the early part of reaping, but the main reaping is done entirely by men. Transportation of grain to the mounds is also carried out by men, and it is they only who have access to the grain stores when quantities are withdrawn for family use. Sheep-shearing is [236] carried out entirely by males,[10] the fleeces are stacked by them and the [432] distribution and sales of these is directed by the male head of the tent.

Additional to these major tasks which males undertake are a number of minor ones. Men sew strips of cotton together to make clothes for both sexes. They also make rope of grass, albeit in a desultory sort of way, by twisting together the strands between the palms of the hands. A number of [834] other tasks fall to the men by virtue of the fact that the sexes are separated [342] in the tent by a divider of blanket material, which may be taken down when only members of the elementary family are about, but which is put

[461] [533] [538] [831] [10] This work is reserved for the younger men and takes the form of a festival during which lewd songs are sung and poems with obscene themes or references are recited loudly and within the hearing of elders, in a manner not dissimilar to the behaviour of bachelors at a wedding.

Cases

621 592 578 [604] [428] [593] Genealogically he was their father's brother, but he was of their same age generation, and behaved as if he was their agnatic equal. Towards his own brother (16), he behaved as if the latter was his uncle, for he was much his junior in age and his uncle had virtually brought him up from boyhood. They had quarrelled bitterly because his brother (16) had given him only a fraction of his inheritance, which he himself, in turn, should have shared with his young full brother (not shown on the diagram) but he did not do so. This youngest brother left (15) for this reason and now resides with (16), his full brother's enemy. Two of the men (14 and 13) of this group of four were the chief herdsmen of the camp, although they were assisted for short periods by (12) and (15), who also helped tend the camels in other ways. Their connection with the group centered on Tent A was a mutual close link to a politically powerful person (not shown on the genealogies) to whom they are deeply loyal and who, while I was among them, was actively opposed to the common political enemy of them all (16), and who in earlier years had challenged the leadership of (2) of Tent A. There is also the fact that they were all linked within a close range of agnation. This linkage included, too, the owner of Tent F (17), not in fact the descendant of the man shown in the diagram — he was the son of a slave wife; his genitor was a slave, but his mother's master reared him, freed him and he is now given as his son in the genealogy. He lives with his wife, of client origin, together with her children from a previous husband, (18), who divorced her, and his own children. Aging, he no longer acted as a regular herdsmen, but relieved other men in the camp, and also spent some time shepherding.

621 571 The details given of the strands which run through the camp to tie these particular people together are so few that, like the Bedouin plough, they do no more than scratch the surface, but they are sufficient to permit a few general statements. The camp, and particularly the precise disposition of its tents, shows a group of males clustered together to share two of the main economic tasks: shepherding and herding. The physically strong adult males of Tents D and E shoulder the burden of herding all the camels of the camp, and the men of Tents B, A and C shepherd all the sheep, with (17) of Tent F serving both purposes. This number of men allows some to remain in the camp at all times, to free one of them for a journey to the distant market when supplies of sugar and tea are necessary, and to enable one or two men, at short notice, to hurry away on horse or camel to search for lost animals.[14]

621 574 231 262 43 [556] **Economic Determinants of the General Structure of the Camp**

It is also clear from these details that, given the disparities in wealth (although all men have some wealth), the diet of most is considerably

[14] There is little point in seeking the lost animals themselves in the first instance. A man travels from camp to camp asking for information, and when he has gathered his clues, he searches a neighbourhood.